HAD MOVEMENT Sir

round of Allahabad addre

two-nation theory ALIGAR

THE WAR OF INDEPENDENC

OR THE PARTITION OF THE SUBCONTINEN

ROAD TO PAKISTAN

Quaid-i-Azam

PAKISTAN

HISTORY OF THE IDEA OF PAKISTAN

A. S. KHURSHID

HISTORY

OF THE

IDEA OF PAKISTAN

DR. ABDUS SALAM KHURSHID

National Committee
for Birth Centenary Celebrations of
Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah

National Book Foundation, Press Trust House,
I.I. Chundrigar Road, Karachi.

First Edition: 1977

Price: Rs. 20

National Book Foundation
KARACHI-ISLAMABAD-LAHORE-PESHAWAR-SUKKUR-QUETTA-MULTAN

Printed at MA'AREF Printers, Karachi-46.

FOREWORD

This is a modest attempt at tracing the origin and development of the idea of Pakistan, but this does not claim to be a story of our national struggle for emancipation. Wherever necessary, some political developments have been recorded, but the emphasis has throughout been on the genesis and growth of the idea of establishing a separate State or States based on the Muslims' right of self-determination.

The author has digressed from the normal practice of giving footnotes on each page or at the end of each chapter. Instead, he has given all references within the body of the text, so that the reader is saved of the trouble of referring again and again to the footnotes.

(ABDUS SALAM KHURSHID)

September 15, 1976

CONTENTS

PERSPECTIVE

SHAH Waliullah, a great religious scholar of the eighteenth century, attributed Muslim decline to the following causes:

(a) Lack of understanding religion in its proper perspective and true spirit.

(b) Reversion from the principle of *Khilafat* to Kingship.

(c) Emergence of a rich class of feudal lords and nobles, sunk deep in an immoral luxurious life.

(d) Heavy drain on *Bait-ul-Mal* because of the existence of a very large number of people who were financially dependent on the State, without any productive activity of their own.

(e) Serious unrest among cultivators, traders and professional workers because they had to bear the brunt of almost all taxes.

To alleviate the situation, Shah Waliullah aimed at a moral, social and political regeneration of Muslims in the true spirit of Islam, so that an ideally equitable social system could be brought into vogue.

Efforts for the revival of Muslim glory ran in two parallel directions. On the one hand, the ruling classes sought revival of Muslim political power in the subcontinent, without probing deeply into the real malady while, on the other, worked peoples movements, drawing inspiration from the teachings of Shah Waliullah. The former included Siraj-ud-Dawlah, Hyder Ali and Tipu Sultan, while the latter comprised Moulvi Shariatullah and his followers in Bengal and Syed Ahmad Shaheed Barelvi, Shah Ismail Shaheed and their companions and followers, who mainly worked in Northern India.

Alarmed at the growing danger to the Muslim power, posed by the united front of the British colonialism and the Hindu trading and financial classes, Siraj-ud-Dawlah, the 24-year-old young ruler of Bengal, waged a war against the British in 1757, known as the Battle of Plassey, lost it and ultimately was assassinated. He was replaced by puppets and later the British annexed Bengal.

At about the same time, there emerged Hyder Ali, a dynamic soldier who became the ruler of Mysore, where he introduced a somewhat equitable social and economic system. He had to fight against heavy odds, fought battles against the British, the Nizam of Hyderabad Deccan and against the Marhattas. He brought about a triple alliance of Mysore, Hyderabad Deccan and Marhattas with a view to exterminating the British from the subcontinent. However, it did not work and while he was fighting the British single-handedly, he died of cancer in 1782.

Hyder Ali was succeeded by Tipu Sultan, his son, who was a highly religious man. Tipu Sultan was responsible for the abolition of feudalism and introduction of peasant-proprietorship and for the establishment of a just and equitable system of government. Tipu Sultan expanded the Navy built by his father, wrote letters to the rulers of Iran and the Ottoman Empire for exchange of naval bases, and at one time entered into an alliance with the French. He had to wage two important wars against the British and ultimately died in the battlefield in 1799. With his death the Sultanate of Mysore came to an end.

Syed Ahmad of Bareli, inspired by the teachings of Shah Waliullah, organized a people's army of volunteers, marched from Rajputana to Sind, Baluchistan and then to Kabul, where having failed to bring about a rapprochement between the warring tribes, came to Peshawar and made the present N.W.F.P. his base. His object was to set up the nucleus of an *Imamat* based on Shariah and wage war against the Sikhs with a view to capturing Punjab and ultimately work for the revival of Muslim glory in the rest of the subcontinent. In collaboration with the

Pathans, he fought a number of successful battles. When betrayed by the local population because of the stringency of Shariah Rule, he decided to make Kashmir the centre of his activities. While on way to Kashmir, he had to fight a battle with Sikhs at Balakot. The Battle was lost, and he along with a number of colleagues died in the battlefield. Most of the volunteers left for India while a group of 150 made the tribal area their permanent abode.

The War of Independence

In 1857, the War of Independence was fought valiantly with Muslims in the vanguard. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan in his *Risala-i-Asbab-i-Baghawat-i-Hind* (The Causes of Indian Revolt) cited the following causes:

1. The revolt was the outcome of the frustrations and the accumulated wrongs of decades on the part of the British rulers in whom the people had lost all faith.
2. Active patronage given by the rulers to Christian missionaries led to the belief that the government wanted to interfere with people's religion.
3. The rapacity of money-lending classes and the unusually heavy rates of revenue assessments had ruined many families financially and undermined their allegiance to the British.
4. The disbandment of the princely armies and dissolution of native durbars gave rise to widespread unemployment.
5. Indigenous industries were throttled by the competition of cheap machine-made goods imported from Britain.
6. Government had kept itself isolated from the people by neither associating them with the administration nor listening to their grievances.
7. The Muslims did not join the revolt out of sheer perversity: they had an understandable case against the government, for the rigours of the administrative system bore harshly upon them.

8. The systematic exclusion of Muslims from higher administrative ranks, which they had practically monopolised in the past under successive dynasties, had caused great unrest.

Sir Syed's analysis is true but it smacks of a thesis that if the British had been a little more considerate to the Muslims, probably the things could not take the shape of a revolt. This is not correct because it was neither a revolt nor a mutiny. It was a war of independence motivated by the people's desire to be free and be the masters of their own destiny. Therefore, causes cited by Sir Syed could at best be called the contributory factors and not the fundamental ones.

The fundamental causes were political and ideological. One group that comprised Muslim nobles, erstwhile rulers, and those associated with them fought only for regaining the political power they had lost, and also the economic advantages they had for pretty long but were snatched away by the British in collusion with the Hindu capitalist class. That is why Bahadur Shah Zafar, the last Moghal Emperor, was made the symbol of the War of Independence. They received support from the general mass of people because the people had succumbed to the foreign domination in the hope that the change of masters would lead to the establishment of a new and better order in place of the fast-tottering and exploiting feudal system of the later Moghals. But when their hopes came to naught and a worst system came into being, they joined hands with those who raised the banner of revolt against the British. There was another group comprising religious scholars, the remnants of Syed Ahmad Shaheed's campanions and followers who had set up a network of secret organizations.

The Jihad Movement

Syed Ahmad Shaheed's militant followers kept the flame of *Jihad* burning for more than half-a-century after his death. Among them Maulvi Ahmadullah and Maulvi Yahya Ali of Patna and Maulvi Muhammad Ja'afar Thanesari were in the forefront. As Dr. Mahmud Hussain says: "A regular system of collecting taxes,

and preaching *Jihad* was established right from Eastern Bengal to the North-Western Frontier. Although so widespread, the movement was organized with the utmost secrecy. All the active members of the movement functioned under fictitious names and corresponded in code." The workers maintained liaison with the remnants of Syed Ahmad Shaheed's campanions who had stayed on in the tribal belt. They supplied them with money and other materials. As a result there were repeated attacks on British positions on the North-Western Frontier of the subcontinent. During the 25 years that followed the War of Independence, the British sponsored a number of conspiracy trials against the *Mujahideen*. As a result, the three leaders alongwith their comrades, were sentenced to transportation for life to the Andaman Islands, and their entire property, both movable and immovable, was confiscated. The family houses of Moulvi Ahmadullah and Moulvi Yahya Ali in Sadiqpur, Patna were demolished and in their place, municipal offices were built.

Moulvi Ahmadullah and Maulvi Yahya Ali died in the Andaman Islands while Moulvi Muhammad Ja'afar Thanesari was released after eighteen years. His memoirs entitled "Kala Pani" throws interesting sidelights on the movement.

As a result of ruthless suppression on the part of the British, the movement fizzled out in the course of time.

Deoband Movement

Shah Waliullah's moderate followers worked on the intellectual front. In their opinion the Western educational system posed a threat to Islam, therefore, the crying need of the hour was the initiative of a new system of religious education. Among these, the most prominent person was Maulana Muhammad Qasim who founded *Dar-ul-Uloom* of Deoband. A nine-year syllabus was introduced that included medicine, calligraphy and training in a number of handicrafts so that it could help the *alumni* in earning a respectable livelihood. The *Dar-ul-Uloom* soon took the shape of a movement. Several educational institutions on similar patterns sprang up at various places. The movement also laid

emphasis on social and moral reforms like widow marriage, women's rights of inheritance and abolition of ceremonies and customs repugnant to the spirit of Islam.

Shibli No'mani laid the foundations of *Nadva-tul-Ulama*, an educational institution with a better system of education. Under its auspices "Al-Nadwa", a journal was started, which was edited by Shibli, Abul Kalam Azad, Syed Sulaiman Nadvi and Abdus Salam Nadvi one after the other. The sister institution *Dar-ul-Musannifin* of Azamgarh played a notable role in the field of research and published a large number of standard books on Islamic history, philosophy and culture.

JAMALUDDIN AFGHANI

THE concentration of Muslim majorities in the north-west and north-east of the subcontinent could not remain unnoticed by political thinkers. Syed Jamaluddin Al-Afghani, the famous worker in the cause of world Islamic unity, first thought of the possibility of a Muslim Republic embracing the present Central Asian Socialist Republics, Afghanistan and the Muslim majority areas in the north-west of the subcontinent", says Dr. Ishtiaq Hussain Qureshi, in his work entitled "The Struggle of Pakistan" (p. 117).

Historically, the statement is not correct. Firstly, because it is not mentioned in any of the dozens of Afghani's biographies published in the subcontinent and abroad. Secondly, if one goes through the various collections of his articles published in his short-lived paper "Al-Urwa-tul-Wusqa" of Paris in 1884 and of his contributions to various Urdu and Persian journals of the subcontinent made during his stay here, and also if one goes through his letters included in some biographies written by Western authors, one does not find any clue to the statement that he ever had an idea of the preponderance of Muslim population in the north-west or north-east of India on whose basis he is alleged to have suggested the establishment of a Muslim Republic including these regions.

Seeing through the contents of his articles in "Al-Urwa-tul-Wusqa" the author found three extracts pertaining directly or indirectly to the subcontinent which are as follows:

"From Adrianople to Peshawar we find a number of Islamic States. Their borders are contiguous to each other. They form part of one collective unit of Quranic law. Their population is not less than two hundred million. In bravery and chivalry they have an edge over all nations in all times. Then, should it not be

their mission to coordinate their efforts against their enemies and restore their national honour like other nations?" (*Mazamin-i-Jamaluddin Afghani*, pp. 70-71).

Syed Jamaluddin Afghani continuously urged upon Iran and Afghanistan to forge a united front and said: "To my mind, perhaps you have not forgotten the fact that the British gained a foothold in India because the Iranians and the Afghans were engaged in internecine warfare. Do you not know that the eyes of every Muslim in India are focussed on the Punjab. They are, every moment, expecting that you (Iranians) in unison with Afghans would march on the Punjab" (*Ibid*, p. 93).

"The people of Iran and Afghanistan ought to know that at this critical juncture, their differences are not only highly damaging to their own interests but also to the interest of their Indian Muslim brethren. Therefore, it is their duty to maintain the dignity of the *Kalima* and religious affinities and that they do not use petty sectarian differences as an excuse to reducing the fundamental relations. It is not at all wise to destroy the Muslim unity for the sake of partial difference of opinion." (*Ibid*, p. 99).

One could draw the following inferences:

(a) Afghani sought to forge a united front of the Muslim nations against colonialism.

(b) He wanted Iran and Afghanistan to invade India, liberate Muslims and restore the Muslim political power which held sway for a number of centuries.

(c) He mentioned Peshawar as part of the Muslim world, no doubt, but he did not go beyond that and there is no indication that he had noticed the Muslim majority in the areas that came into the fold of Pakistan half-a-century after his death.

Of course he visited the subcontinent five times and once he stayed for more than a couple of years—but not in the region now forming Pakistan, but in Calcutta, Hyderabad Deccan and Bombay; and made short sojourns in a number of other cities.

He addressed gatherings of intellectuals and wrote articles for two magazines of Hyderabad Deccan namely "Muallim" and "Muallim-i-Shafeeq", two newspapers of Lucknow namely "Awadh Akhbar" and "Musheer-i-Qaisar" and for the Persian language weekly "Habl-ul-Mateen" of Calcutta. He also wrote a pamphlet named "Radd-i-Naturiyyat". In the last chapter of that he enunciated his fundamental objectives which could thus be summarised:

1. To free the minds of the people of superstitions.
2. To make the people realise that they could reach the highest pinnacle of the nobility of character except prophethood.
3. Promotion of religious belief is the first pre-requisite of Muslim revival but they should not be based on *Taqleed* (blind following) but on reason as Islam is the only religion that makes an appeal to reason.
4. Let there be two groups of devotees—one aiming at mass education and the other at the moral regeneration of the people.
5. Islam is the only religion that could bring succour to the humanity at large and lead the nations to happiness and prosperity, but every thing depends on the will of the Muslim peoples as God helps those who help themselves.

Jamaluddin Afghani was a contemporary of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. Their views on Muslim renaissance through education, through moral regeneration, through a reasoned approach towards the understanding of Islam, through abandoning superstitions and bad customs having crept into the Muslim society; and through reviving the glory that was Islam, were strikingly similar but somehow or the other, they could not see eye to eye with each other, perhaps because of Sir Syed's loyalty to the British and also because of Sir Syed's transgression of limits in his over-rational approach to the interpretation of Quranic precepts, which even after the passage of a century is not acceptable to the

Muslim masses even now. A suspect in the eyes of the British and constantly shadowed by the C.I.D., Jamaluddin Afghani could not attack his British proclivities, therefore, he canalized his opposition to Sir Syed in the direction of his religious views, wrote a number of articles on the subject and even used abusive epithets.

It is interesting to note that Syed Jamaluddin Afghani, in the course of an article in "Muallim" of Hyderabad Deccan, told the British that if they wanted to win the hearts of the people and strengthen their position in the subcontinent, they should adopt Urdu as the official language. He did not question the utility of studying English as a language as it opened new avenues of knowledge but expressed the opinion that if western knowledge was to be disseminated on a large scale, Urdu be made the medium of instruction and for that books on modern sciences be translated into that language.

Non-political impact of Syed Jamaluddin Afghani was substantial but so far as political impact is concerned, we have not much information at our disposal. However, his British friend and well-known writer Wilfred Scawen Blunt, who visited India immediately after Afghani had left, says: "The letters the Shaikh (Afghani) gave me proved of the greatest possible use to me. I found him held everywhere in India in the highest esteem and I was received as few Englishmen would have been, for his sake. At Calcutta, there were a number of Muslim students who were entirely devoted to his Pan-Islamic doctrines of liberal reform and the same was the case in other chief cities of North India" (quoted by Sharifuddin Pirzada). Again Blunt revealed that Syed did not like Syed Amir Ali and considered Abdul Latif of Calcutta a coward.

We also have a biased version of Afghani's political impact from Bipin Chandra Pal, a nationalist turned communalist Hindu leader of this century. In his book "Nationality and Empire" he states that "Afghani inspired many leaders of Muslim thought in Calcutta and Bombay and other cities with his new views" (of

Pan-Islamism) and further said "...the seed that he had sown among us grew in secret for over a quarter of a century. Its only outer manifestation was seen in a new self-consciousness of our Muslim neighbours, a new concept of separate communal interests, and a new desire to review in the name of purity, the old iconoclastic spirit of the Islamic faith and thereby to work a new religious cleavage between the Muslims and their Hindu neighbours" (pp. 370-71).

Bipin Chandra Pal made a more precise statement in his subsequent work "Memories of My Life and Times". He said: "It was about 1880 or 1881 that Jamaluddin, the founder of the Pan-Islamic movement, came from Afghanistan to India, and had confidential conversations with the leaders of the Mohamedan community in this country. He came to Calcutta and met the late Nawab Abdul Latif and the small group of educated Muslims associated with him, including the late Justice Amir Ali, and inoculated them with the views of his Pan-Islamism. Before Jamaluddin's advent the educated Muslims, particularly in Bengal, had been loyally co-operating with their Hindu fellow-subjects for the common advancement of national political interest. But with his views they commenced to draw themselves away from the political activities of their Hindu fellow-subjects, until gradually a wide gulf was created between the Hindu and the Muslim intellectuals in the country in regard to our national endeavours" (p. 417).

However, the question remains as to how and why the origin of the idea of Pakistan was attributed to Syed Jamaluddin Afghani when there is nothing on record to show that he sponsored this idea. This was perhaps because his British friend Blunt broached the idea. In his book "Ideas About India", he wrote: "The stronghold of Muslims in India is the North-West and there Islam is far from helpless or disposed to perish. Intellectually the equals and morally the superiors of their Hindu neighbours, the Muslims of the upper Ganges Valley have not forgotten that till very lately administration of India was almost entirely in their hands and they look upon their declining fortunes as neither deserved nor irremediable" (p. 89, quoted by Pirzada).

Elsewhere in the same book, he discarded the idea of a single unitary government for the whole continent. He said: "At the same time I would not be understood as advocating for India anything in the shape of an Imperial Parliament. India is far too vast a continent and inhabited by races far too heterogeneous to make amalgamation in a single assembly possible for representatives elected on any conceivable system . . . any attempts of the sort at present would find for themselves the inevitable fate of the Tower of Babel. With the provinces and for all provincial affairs, self-government is a growing necessity, and the present age is quite capable of witnessing it in practice. I would like to see each province of India entirely self-managed as regards civil matters". (p. 163, quoted by Pirzada).

There was nothing novel in this idea, for as early as in June 1858, John Bright, a British parliamentarian of repute, had suggested that instead of an Empire, there should be five presidencies, equal in rank with their own councils, finance, taxation, justice, police and military with capitals at Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, Agra and Lahore. In the course of a speech, he said: "If that were to go for a century or more, there would be five or six Presidencies of India built up into so many compact states; and if at any future period the sovereignty of England should be withdrawn, we should leave so many Presidencies built up and finally compacted together, each able to support its own independence and its own Government; and we should be able to say we had not left the country a prey to that anarchy and discord which I believe to be inevitable if we insist on holding these vast territories with the idea of building them up into one great Empire" (p. 14). In the same speech he continued: "But how long does any man with the smallest glimmering of commonsense believe that such a vast country, with its twenty different nations and its twenty languages, can ever be bound up and consolidated into one compact and enduring Empire? I believe such a thing to be utterly impossible."

Blunt went a step further and suggested the establishment of two autonomous states under the British aegis, one for the Muslims and the other for the Hindus. Khalid bin Saeed quoting from

Blunt's book "India under Ripon — A private Diary" says: "In December 1883, Blunt suggested in Calcutta that in his view practically all the provinces of Northern India should be placed under Muslim Government and those of Southern India under Hindu Government. In this scheme, of course, the Britishers were to continue as the controlling power drawing their support from British troops stationed in each of the Provinces but "whole civil administration, legislation and finance should be left to native hands".

As Blunt was a close associate and friend of Jamaluddin Afghani and as he made the suggestion just a year after the exit of Afghani from India, it is quite plausible that the two had compared notes on the subject. However, that still disproves the theory that Afghani aimed at the establishment of an independent Muslim Republic comprising Central Asian regions, Afghanistan and the Muslim majority regions in North-West of Indian subcontinent. In fact, Syed Jamaluddin Afghani never stood for a merger of Muslim states. His principal object in life was that all Muslim countries should, in the first instance, free themselves from the shackles of foreign rule, eliminate all foreign intervention, strengthen themselves and later, through coordination and understanding, establish a sort of Commonwealth of Muslim Nations.

SIR SYED AT THE CROSSROADS

SIR Syed Ahmad Khan, the Muslim social reformer of the nineteenth century and a firm believer in the two-nation theory, refused to join the Indian National Congress, as according to him there did not exist an "Indian Nation". He declined to encourage the establishment of democratic and representative institutions as Muslims were a permanent minority and liable to be submerged by a permanent Hindu majority. And whenever he thought of the political future of the subcontinent he visualised an equality of political power held by the two major nations of India, but he had no concrete political solution to offer, no vision of the shape of things to come and, therefore, remained at the crossroads in so far as politics was concerned. It was perhaps because of this, that he continued advising Muslims to keep aloof from politics and confine their activities to those fields which could bring about a cultural renaissance and a moral and social regeneration through adherence to the real Islamic values and reawakening them to modern thinking. The continuation of various efforts in that direction is known as the Aligarh Movement of which he was the moving spirit. To understand his political views it is imperative that one keeps in view the highlights of that movement.

During the life-time of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, the Aligarh Movement passed through the following phases:

1. Healing of the breach between the ruler and the ruled by assuiing the British of Muslim loyalty and the necessary adjustment to and compromises with the new order.
2. To bring about a closer understanding between the two, it was considered necessary to awaken the minds of the people to European Literature, science and technology.

With that spirit the Scientific Society was established in 1863, that published Urdu translations of standard English works on chemistry, physics, light, heat and other scientific subjects as well as elementary and advanced works on mathematics. The Society also published the "Scientific Society Magazine" or "Akhbar Scientific Society", later named "Aligarh Institute Gazette". This bi-lingual weekly continued for thirty-two years (1866—1898). It was a fine example of sober and responsible journalism. Non-communal in outlook, it projected people's feelings and emotions on topics of current interest.

3. For the social regeneration of Muslims, another journal named "Tahzeeb-ul-Akhlaq" or "Muhammad—Social Reformer" was sponsored in 1870 which continued for about seven years during its first phase. That aimed at promoting a rational religious outlook among Muslims, furthering the cause of education in Western and oriental branches of learning, reminding Muslims of their past glory and at disseminating new cultural values in order to civilise them. The journal also played a great role in impressing upon Muslims not to squander away money in wasteful channels, abandon un-Islamic customs and to take greater interest in business and commerce. The journal, in fact, covered all aspects of life and in its foot-steps followed several journals throughout the subcontinent.

4. To acquaint the Muslims with the western learning, the Anglo-Mohammadan College was established in Aligarh, which, about a couple of decades after the death of its founder, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, took the form of the Muslim University of Aligarh. The purpose was to help in the emergence of a class of Muslim intellectuals well-versed in Muslim traditions as well as in western learning, that could provide a conscientious and enlightened leadership as well as men for official cadres and civil services

so that Muslims could, in course of time get their due share in the administration. Similar institutions were established in other parts of the subcontinent.

5. The Aligarh Movement also embraced literary renaissance in its fold. Sir Syed's lead in initiating a simple and lucid Urdu prose was followed by contemporaries like Hali, Shibli, Nazir Ahmad and others. A new form of poetry emerged with Hali in lead. Thus Urdu literature took a more meaningful and purposeful form.

It is often said that in the beginning Sir Syed believed in Indian nationalism but later due to Hindi-Urdu controversy, his faith in a united India was shaken and he began to advocate the two-nation theory. As a proof of his original faith in a united India, the following quotation is cited: "India is like a beautiful bridge whose two eyes are the Hindus and Mussulmans and her beauty consists in that her two eyes be of equal lustre." In fact the extract shows that he visualised an India where the Hindus and Muslims would be recognised as two separate nations brought together on an equal footing, *i.e.,* sharing equally the political power. Pirzada says that "regarding this statement, K.M. Pannikar in his *Survey of Indian History* states that the two-nation theory was advocated by Sir Syed when he declared that Hindus and Muslims were the two eyes of India". (p. 48).

However, very soon he realised that even that kind of arrangement would not be possible. He told an English friend in 1867 as follows: "Now I am convinced that both these nations will not join whole-heartedly in anything. At present there is no open hostility between the two communities, but on account of the so-called educated people it will increase immediately in future. He who lives, will see," (quoted by Hali). The most significant statement came in the course of a speech in 1883 when he said: "Now suppose that all the Britishers were to leave India . . . then who would be the ruler of India? Is it possible that under the circumstances the two nations—the Muslims and Hindus—could sit on the same throne and remain equal in power? Most certainly not. It is necessary that one of them should conquer the other

and thrust it down. To hope that both could remain equal is to desire the impossible and the inconceivable." (quoted by Richard Symonds, p. 71).

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was a supporter of representative and elective institutions but not in the context of the situation in the subcontinent and he had very strong reasons for that. In 1883, he gave a speech on the Bill for providing the method of elections for the municipalities, in which he made his point very clear. He said: "The principle of self-government by means of representative institutions is perhaps the greatest and noblest lesson which the beneficence of England will teach India. But, in borrowing from England the system of representative institutions, it is of greatest importance to remember those socio-political matters in which India is distinguishable from England. The present socio-political condition of India is the outcome of the history of centuries of despotism and mis-rule, of dominance of race over race, of religion over religion. The traditions and feelings of the people and their present economic and political conditions are in a vast measure influenced and regulated by the history of the past; the humanizing effects of the British rule have not yet demolished the remembrance of the days of strife and discard which preceded the peace brought to India by the British supremacy. India a continent in itself, is inhabited by vast population of different races and different creeds; the rigour of religious institutions has kept even neighbours apart; the system of caste is still dominant and powerful. In one and same district the population may consist of various creeds and nationalities, and whilst one section of the population commands wealth and commerce, the other may possess learning and influence, one section may be numerically larger than the other, and the standard of enlightenment which one section of the community has reached may be far higher than that attained by the rest of the population. One community may be fully alive to the importance of receiving representation on the local boards and district councils, whilst the other may be wholly indifferent to such matters . . . under the circumstance, it is hardly possible to deny that the introduction of representative

institutions in India will be attended with considerable difficulty and socio-political risks" (quoted by Khaliquzzaman, pp. 269-70).

Four years later, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, while addressing the Mohammedan Educational Conference session at Lucknow, came out with a clear-cut, precise and categorical statement on this issue when he said: "They want to copy the British House of Lords and the House of Commons. Now let us imagine the Viceroy's Council made in this manner. And let us suppose that all the Muslim electors vote for a Muslim member and all the Hindu voters vote for a Hindu member, and now count how many votes the Muslim members will have, and how many the Hindus. It is certain that the Hindu member will have four times as many because their population is four times as numerous. Therefore, we can prove by mathematics that there will be four votes for the Hindus to every one vote, for the Muslim. And now how can the Muslim guard his interest? It will be like a game of dice, in which one man had four dice and the other only one."

In 1885 emerged the Indian National Congress. It was founded by Mr. A.O. Hume, a retired English civil servant. The object was "social regeneration as a means for political advancement". It had the blessings of the Governor-General, Lord Dufferin, who desired the organization to develop into a controlled and responsible opposition and serve as a canalizing agent for the simmering discontent among the intelligentsia. There were a number of factors that helped in the emergence of this organization which may be thus summarised:

1. The principal source of patriotic inspiration was furnished by the English literature, European and American history and their accounts of struggles for freedom. The western education came first to the Hindus: so did the new nationalism.
2. The revivalist movements among the Hindus promoted Hindu nationalism. On the one hand, Swami Vivekananda, the spokesman of Rama Krishna Mission asserted that the world had still to learn a lot from the spiritual Hindu nation and even from idolatory which he called "the

most admirable and edifying form of devotion". On the other hand, emerged the Arya Samaj Movement founded by Swami Dayananda, which, although liberal in outlook, preached a return to the ancient Vedic faith, stressed the Unity of God and extirpation of alien faiths like Islam and Christianity. India for Indians was its battle cry.

3. Then there was the racial hatred against the British who had gone to their ivory-tower of isolation after the shock they had suffered in 1857. The personal ties with the people were almost non-existent.
4. Some Englishmen in India even "forgot the most elementary rules of decent behaviour. Indians were not allowed into English society, restaurants and clubs. The mutual hatred assumed dimensions when a very large number of Indians were killed by some Englishmen who either remained unpunished or got light penalties.
5. In 1882, the Ilbert Bill was suggested, which allowed the Indian magistrates of some standing to try European criminals. The English community in the subcontinent raised a hue and cry against this measure, and to counter this the Indians organized great demonstrations particularly in Bengal. That strengthened further the nationalist movement.

The organization, though sponsored by the British, was managed and controlled by the Hindu intelligentsia and included an insignificant number of Muslims at a later stage. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan had tabooed politics for Muslims; therefore, none of his associates and followers joined it. However, when in 1888 both Hume and Badruddin Tayabji, a Muslim member of the Congress, invited him to join, his reply was as follows: "I do not understand what the words *National Congress* mean. Is it supposed that the different castes and creeds living in India belong to one nation, or can become a nation, and their aims and aspirations be one and the same? I think it is quite impossible, and when it is impossible there can be no such thing as a *National Congress*, nor can it be of equal benefit to all peoples. You regard the doings of the

misnamed National Congress beneficial to India, but I am sorry to say that I regard them as not only injurious to our own community but also to India at large. I object to every Congress in any shape or form whatever, which regards India as one nation."

Sir Syed's trend of thought could further be guaged from the following extract quoted by Majumdar, a modern Indian historian in "History of the Freedom Movement in India", vol. I (p. 481), from Syed's *Akhbari Mazamin* (pp. 46-50): "In a country like India where homogeneity does not exist in any one of these fields (nationality, religion, ways of living, customs, mores, culture and historical traditions), the introduction of representative government cannot produce any beneficial results, it can only result in interfering with the peace and prosperity of the land.... The aims and objects of the Indian National Congress are based upon an ignorance of history and present-day realities. They do not take into consideration that India is inhabited by different nationalities.... I consider the experiment, which the Indian National Congress wants to make, fraught with dangers and sufferings for all the nationalities of India, specially for the Muslims. The Muslims are in a minority, but they are a highly united minority. At least traditionally they are prone to take the sword in hand when the majority oppresses them. If this happens, it will bring about disasters greater than the ones which came in the wake of the happenings of 1857.... The Congress cannot rationally claim to represent the opinions, ideals and aspirations of the Muslims." That shows Sir Syed's firm faith in the two-nation theory and that he visualised a civil war if Congress insisted upon yoking the two nations together. It is gratifying to find that Majumdar counters the denial on the part of the official history of the Congress that the Congress did not represent the Muslims. He expresses the views that the Muslim supporters of the Congress "were very few and their followers, fewer still". He further adds: "In general it may be said that the Muslims of Northern India, at any rate, were, generally speaking, as firmly attached to the policy of Syed Ahmad as the Hindus in India to the Indian National Congress". (p. 485).

Sir Syed's political views could be summed up thus:

1. That India was a continent, not a country.
2. That it was inhabited by a vast population of different races and different creeds.
3. That among these, Hindus and Muslims, were the two major nations on the basis of nationality, religion, ways of living, customs, mores, culture and historical traditions.
4. After the British quit, they could not share the political power equally. That was simply impossible and inconceivable.
5. The Indian National Congress was not acceptable to the Muslims, also in the absence of one nation, the nomenclature of the Congress is fundamentally wrong.
6. Muslims could not accept a democratic set up of Western type because with a one to four ratio of population, they would be enslaved by the Hindus.
7. There would be a disastrous civil war if the Congress persisted in its policy of yoking together the two nations.

That brings us to the important question as to what Sir Syed actually wanted and what political future he visualised for the Muslim nation and whether he saw the safety of the Muslims in the perpetuation of the British rule? Here Majumdar provides us with the necessary data that may serve as a clue to the understanding of what was agitating the mind of Sir Syed. Majumdar says: "There is no doubt that Syed Ahmad succeeded in keeping back the bulk of Muslims from the Congress. They made no secret of reasons for their action. In 1896, Rahimtullah Sayani, a distinguished Muslim, presided over the Congress Session. Haji Muhammad Ismail Khan, a friend of Syed Ahmad, suggested to the Congress President that the Congress should pass a resolution to the effect that the Hindus and Muslims should have equal number of seats in the legislative councils, district boards and municipalities. This showed where the shoe pinched. Sayani could not accept Ismail Khan's proposal. Syed Ahmad, however, endorsed it, and

wrote in an article that the Muslims could join the Congress only if the Congress agreed to the proposal of Ismail Khan." (p. 486, vol. I).

That brings us to the conclusion that Sir Syed visualised a democratic system of government in a two-nation country provided both the nations had parity in representation at all levels, right from the central legislation to the local bodies throughout the country. But that was what he considered "impossible and inconceivable" in 1883.

HINDUS ON CHAUVINIST PATH

"INDIA has been called an ethnological museum: it is a land with an infinite variety of races, religions and languages", says Roberts in the "History of British India" (p. 8). "No lasting imperial dominion in India was ever established by a Hindu people, though on three occasions such an event appeared to come within the bounds of probability" (p. 9), he added. According to Roberts "India falls naturally into two great divisions. First, Hindustan, which consists of the Himalayan system, the great northern alluvial plains and the broken central plateau of Malwa and Bundelkhand; secondly, the Deccan, the triangular shaped peninsula of the south" (p. 2). The Encylopaedia Britannica calls it "a great subcontinent of Asia under British rule inhabited by a congeries of different races speaking some two hundred diffeıent languages". Dr. Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi says: "The conception of a land called India was created by the Muslims, before whose rule its several parts were known by different names. In fact, having seldom known political unity, it was a collection of several countries with their distinctive languages and customs . . . . " (p. 2). And Majumdar, the modern Indian historian opines: "The whole country was divided into a large number of self-contained units, almost mutually exclusive in character, and the conception of India as a common motherland was still in the realm of fancy. There was no India as it is understood today. There were Bengalis, Hindustanis, Marathas, Sikhs, etc. but no Indian, at the beginning of nineteenth century." (vol. I, p. 323). Even the British sometimes officially called India a continent rather than a subcontinent, for in reply to the representation made by the Simla Deputation in 1906, Lord Minto, the Viceroy of India said: "I am as firmly convinced as I believe you to be that any electoral representation in India would be doomed to mischievous

failure which aimed at granting a personal enfranchisement, regardless of the beliefs and traditions of the communities comprising the population of this continent."

No doubt Pakistan is the outcome of the two-nation concept and the long and arduous struggle on the part of Mussulmans inhabiting the Continent for the maintenance and preservation of their national identity, culture and ideology. However, it is interesting to note that separatism was inherent in the situation for the preceding several centuries and it remained an historical reality even in the eyes of the Hindus, who adopted a chauvinist line against the Muslims. In this connection we shall heavily bank upon Mr. R. C. Majumdar, an important modern Indian historian, whose book "History of the Freedom Movement in India" written in 1963 is considered an authoritative work.

Majumdar first gives the following quotation from Al-Beruni's *Kitab-ul-Hind* in 1000 A.D: "The Hindus entirely differ from us in every respect: they totally differ from us in religion, as we believe in nothing in which they believe, and *vice versa*. They call them (Muslims) *maleechha, i.e.,* impure, and forbid having any connection with them, be it by inter-marriage or any other kind of relationship, or by sitting, eating and drinking with them, because thereby, they think, they would be polluted. They consider as impure anything which touches the fire and the water of a foreigner." Majumdar's comment is: "These words were almost equally true in 1800." That is preceded by the remark that the upper class Hindus treated the Muslim masses like the low castes of their own society and further reveals: "Even in the closing years of the nineteenth century, it was a common experience in the villages in Bengal that, except in a few cases, even respectable Muslim gentlemen who visited a caste Hindu's home, had to sit in the verandah and was not admitted inside a room" (pp. 36-37). He reveals that at the beginning of the nineteenth century, Bengal was inhabited by two distinct communities, the Hindus and Muslims.... Even before the establishment of British rule there was a distinct cleavage... the Hindus and Muslims were regarded both by the British and the Indians as two separate communities with distinct culture,

and different physical, moral and mental characteristics. . . Throughout the nineteenth century we find this sharp distinction between the Hindu and Muslim communities reflected in Bengali literature." (pp. 32-34). "In particular, it is strange that the wonderful social democracy of Muslims made absolutely no impression on the Hindus, and far from removing the barriers artificially planted between man and man, rather made them stronger and stronger", he added. (p. 40). Again Majumdar tells us: "Anyone who even cursorily glances through the journals or public addresses of the prominent Hindu leaders of Bengal during the first half of the nineteenth century, will be surprised at the violent denunciation of the Muslim rule, and the enthusiastic, almost rapturous, applause of the British administration which supplanted it". (p. 57).

That was about Bengal. In Northern India, particularly in the Punjab, the Arya Samaj Movement emerged in the closing years of the nineteenth century. It was sponsored by Swami Dayananda whose approach, though liberal in many respects, was positively hostile to Muslims. Majumdar says: "The strong urge of Dayananda to establish Hindu nationalism on a foundation of religious and social unity found a concrete expression in the *Shuddhi* movement. This means the reconversion of those Hindus—millions in number—who had once been willingly or forcibly converted to other religions like Islam or Christianity, but were not willing to come back to the fold of Hinduism. . . . It was strongly resented by the Muslims and was a source of almost chronic feud between the two. At the same time *Shuddhi* was looked upon by the Arya Samaj as a potent instrument for affecting that religious, social or political unity of India which came to be cherished as its great ideal". (pp. 297-98). The Arya Samaj assumed a militant outlook, particularly against the Muslims. According to Bipin Chandra Pal as quoted by Majumdar, its "chief inspiration came from its intense patriotism. This patriotism has always carried with it a spirit of intolerance, if not violent antagonism to other religious systems, particularly the Muslims. Its attitude towards Christianity is not less hostile, though certainly not so open as it is towards Islam. . . . The young Arya Samajists openly declared that they were waiting

for the day when they would settle their account both with the Moslems and the Britishers. (p. 335). Majumdar expresses the view that "there is no doubt that the Arya Samaj aimed at the creation of an Indian nation by establishing a common religion and culture all over India. For that it adopted *Shuddhi* or reconversion into Hinduism of all those who had once renounced it, either willingly or under duress." (p. 336).

Discussing the emergence of Hindu nationalism, Majumdar says: ". . . . in India this historic consciousness operated upon the two major elements of the population, the Hindus and the Muslims, in diametrically opposed ways. Every historical incident in the past that reflected glory upon the one, was a humiliating memory to the other. The triumph of Muhammad ibn Qasim, Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni and Muhammad Ghouri which swelled the price of the Muslims as a great conquering nation of the world, only evoked painful memories of national degradation and humiliation in the minds of the Hindus." (p. 338).

In Bombay appeared the dynamic personality of Bal Gangadhar Tilak, another advocate of Hindu nationalism. "Among the expedients adopted by him were the inauguration of Shivaji festival and the transformation of the traditional worship of Ganapati into an altogether new form. Thus he requisitioned into the national service two of the great forces which are calculated to deeply stir the national mind, namely religion and history. But both the institutions produced diametrically opposite effects upon the Hindus and Muslims. The images of Hindu gods have always inspired the Muslims with iconoclastic fury, and their traditional role in Indian history has been to break them to pieces rather than make them serve any national purpose. Even though bereft of any power to do any mischief, their religion forbade them to derive any good out of it. As Shivaji had founded the Maharashtra Kingdom in the teeth of opposition from the most powerful Muslim Emperor in India, a festival in his honour was well calculated to inspire the masses in Maharashtra. But as Shivaji and the Maratha power founded by him were rightly associated in the minds of the Muslims with the decline or fall of the greatest Muslim Empire in India,

their national vanity was sure to be wounded by doing any honour to the great Maratha leader". (pp. 339-40).

Let us revert to Bengal again which was a very important centre of Hindu nationalism. In 1866, when Sir Syed Ahmad Khan sponsored the Scientific Society Magazine under the auspices of the Scientific Society, established a couple of years earlier for the dissemination of western knowledge, Rajnarain Bose, himself a product of the western education, sponsored in Bengal a "Society for the promotion of National Feeling among the Educated Natives of Bengal". That aimed at discarding imitation of the West and reviewing the old ideas, traditions and customs in every walk of life. The programme included revival of Sanskrit language, promotion of Bengali, adoption of everything indigenous including gymnastic exercises, Hindu medicine and so on. Another leader Nabagopal Mitra enthusiastically took up the ideas preached by Bose. He started in 1867 an annual gathering known as the Hindu Mela (Hindu Festival) in order "to promote the national feeling, sense of patriotism and a spirit of self-help among the Hindus". This continued regularly till 1880. The well-known Bengali poet Rabindra Nath Tagore, when young, was an ardent votary of both Mitra and Bose and his songs written during boyhood were sung at the Mela and they are "still regarded as treasures of Bengali literature". (pp. 330-31).

In 1870, when Sir Syed Ahmad Khan had sponsored his magazine "Tahzib-ul-Akhlaq" (Promotion of Social Reform) a "National Society" was formed in Calcutta by the sponsors of the Hindu Mela. As the mela was confined to the Hindus, objection was taken to the use of the word "National". To this the "National Paper", the official organ of the Mela replied as follows:—"We do not understand why our correspondent takes exception to Hindus who certainly form a 'nation' by themselves, and as such a society established by them can very well be called 'National Society'." Majumdar is responsible for the statement that this was not an isolated expression of views but based on a deep-seated conviction on the part of a large majority of educated Hindus. He says that according to Nabagopal Mitra, the basis of national unity in India

dahbeen the Hindu religion and quoted him as follows: "Hindu nationality is not confined to Bengal. It embraces Hindustan; neither geographical position, nor the language is counted a disability. The Hindus are destined to be a religious nation." (pp.331-32).

After keeping aloof from politics for pretty long Rajnarain Bose too "deliberately proceeded to found nationalism on the basis of Hindu religion as he conceived it". In the course of a lecture delivered in 1872, Bose observed: ". . . . I see in my mind the noble and puissant Hindu nation rousing herself after sleep, and rushing headlong towards progress with divine prowess. I see this rejuvenated nation again illumining the world by her knowledge, spirituality and culture, and the glory of Hindu nation spreading over the whole world." The impact of Rajnarain Bose was great. A large number of Hindus accepted his views with enthusiasm and probably without argument or discussion. (pp. 332-33).

Bankim Chandra Chatterji, the well-known Hindu novelist of Bengal, author of 'Anand Math', the novel that caused great bitterness between Hindus and Muslims and the creator of "Bande Matram", now the national anthem of India and which caused much bad blood between the two nations during the struggle for freedom, was very precise in describing the concept of Hindu Nationhood as he said: "I am a Hindu, you are a Hindu, and there are many lakhs of such Hindus. Whatever is good for them is good for me. Whatever is bad for them is also bad for me. So I must do what is good for all the Hindus. Ram, Sadu, indeed every Hindu must act likewise. If it be so, it is the duty of the Hindus to take counsel together, and agree upon a definite policy and chalk out a common line of action. This conception is the first half of nationalism. There are many nations in the world besides the Hindus. Whatever is good to them is not necessarily good to us. In many cases what is good to them is bad to us. In such cases we must so act as to deprive them of the good. If this involves oppression of other nations, we shall not shrink from it. Similarly something that is good to us might bring evil to them. Even so we must not cease to work for the good of our nation; if that means causing evil to another nation, we shall do so. This is the second half of nationalism."

Referring to the anti-Muslim character of Chatterji's novel "Anand Math" Majumdar expresses the following overall view of the writer's contribution to the estrangement between the two nations: "This aspect of *Anandamath* and the imagery of Goddess Kali leave no doubt that Bankim Chandra's nationalism was Hindu rather than Indian. This is made crystal clear from his other writings which contain a passionate outburst against the subjugation of India by the Muslims. 'From that day set the sun of our glory'—that is the repeated reference of his essays and novels which not unoften contain adverse and sometimes even irreverent remarks against the Muslims. The plots of some of the novels are based on historical fights between Hindus and Muslims, such as Bakhtiyar Khalji's invasion of Bengal, Aurangzeb's fight with the Rajputs, etc., and the reader is here in doubt as to where his sympathies lay". (p. 341).

This bird's eyeview of the Hindu chauvinism during the nineteenth century brings us to the following conclusions:

1. Al-Biruni's one thousand year old view of there being nothing common between the Hindus and Muslims was almost equally true in 1800. Even before the establishment of the British rule, there remained a distinct cleavage.
2. The Hindus and Muslims were regarded both by the British and the Indians as two separate communities with distinct cultures and different physical, moral and mental characteristics.
3. The Arya Samaj of Northern India considered reconversion of Muslims to Hinduism a potent instrument for affecting the religious, social and political unity of India. The young Arya Samajists openly declared their intention "to settle accounts with Muslims".
4. In Bombay, Tilak, an advocate of Hindu nationalism based on religion and history, caused deeper estrangement between the Hindus and the Muslims.
5. In Bengal the approach of the two reformeıs Rajnarain Bose and Nabagopal Mitra and the well-known writers

Bankim Chandra Chatterji, Rabindranath Tagore and others was directed at pure and simple Hindu nationalism with the chauvinist hatred for the Muslims.

All that happened in the nineteenth century when Sir Syed and his supporters confined all efforts to Muslim renaissance in non-political spheres.

PARTITION OF BENGAL AND AFTERMATH

IN 1905 emerged Eastern Bengal and Assam, a new province in the subcontinent. This was the only province where Muslims seriously outnumbered the Hindus, for the Punjab had a negligible Muslim majority, Sind was part and parcel of the Bombay Presidency, the N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan were under the direct control of the British as they were not considered fit for any kind of constitutional reforms even for the following three decades.

The area of the new province was more than double that of the present Bangla Desh. Its population was thirty-one million of whom eighteen million were Muslims and twelve million Hindus. Dacca was its capital. The province was carved out of the Bengal province, the largest in the subcontinent with a population of eighty million. It was too unweildy to be efficiently governed by a single administration. Most of the areas remained unvisited by the Governor. The parliamentary papers of 1905 reveal that important centres like Dacca and Chittagong did not get more than a visit from him within the five years of his tenure and Lovat Fraser in his book "India under Curzon and after" says that admittedly due to its distance from the capital the administration of Eastern Bengal was neglected and its system of communications remained undeveloped with the result that its unguarded waterways facilitated the operation of large-scale organized piracy (p. 372).

It is interesting to note that the Muslims never demanded the partition of Bengal. It was sponsored by the British mainly for administrative reasons. The proposal was in the air since long. It was discussed publicly. The author of "Muslim Separatism in India", Dr. A. Hamid says: "Hindu Bengal interpreted the partition first as an attack on its growing 'national' solidarity: later, as a chastisement for its leading role in the political movement; still

later, as proof of government partiality towards the Muslims; and finally, as establishing Muslim asçendancy. This last conclusion was based on a note, written in 1904, by a high civil servant, Sir Herbert Risley, which stated, among other things, that "the boundary suggested would bring within the eastern province the bulk of the characteristic Muslims of Bengal . . . . (and) it (*i.e.*, the partition) would tend in due course of time, to confer on that city (Dacca) the special character of a provincial capital, where Muslim interests would be strongly represented, if not predominant" (p. 53).

When in October 1905, the new province came into existence, the Muslims naturally welcomed it and even offered thanksgiving prayers. Nawab Salimullah Khan of Dacca established an organization, named Muslim Provincial Union, with the purpose of the "consolidation and conservation of the struggle of the Muslims of the new province as a whole for all public purposes". The Muslim Literary Society of Calcutta issued a statement saying that the measure besides ensuring general administrative advantages was a boon to Muslims. Maulana Muhammad Akram Khan, who later played a very notable role in Muslim politics and who, at that time was the editor of "Muhammadi", first opposed Partition but a year after became a vigorous supporter. The only English-language Muslim weekly "Mussulman" was a silent spectator for it was more of a nationalist than of a separatist paper. A series of articles contributed by Dr. Nazir Ahmad, the well-known novelist and social reformer, to "Shams-i-Bangla", a literary magazine, dealt thoroughly with the advantages of partition. The atmosphere of Muslim optimism created by the partition was one of the major contributing factors to the establishment of the All India Muslim League at whose inaugural session in December 1906 at Dacca, the following resolution was passed unanimously: "Resolved that this meeting, in view of the clear interests of the Mussulmans of Eastern Bengal, considers that the partition is sure to prove beneficial to the Muslim community which constitutes the vast majority of that province, and that all such methods of agitation, as boycotting, should be strongly condemned and discouraged."

And now about the Hindu reaction. We learn from Majumdar, the modern Hindu historian, that during the years 1903-1905, when the partition was under public discussion, more than two thousand public meetings, each attended by 500 to 50,000 people were held, protesting against the proposal. The Bengali newspapers launched a tearing and raging campaign against it. The "Hitavadi" (7-7-05) wrote: "The Bengali race has not within the last 150 years received another such deadly shaft." The "Sandhya" (18-7-05) declared that the object of the partition was to ruin the Bengalis and drive them towards the Europeans. The "Sanjivani" (13-7-05) wrote: "Lord Curzon has thrown a shaft at the heart of the Bengalis . . . . so long as the Bengali race is alive, they will suffer from this agony . . . . Lord Curzon will convert Bengal into a Second Ireland." The "Charan Mihir" (18-7-05) wrote: "By disregarding the unanimous approaches of the entire Bengali-speaking nation, Lord Curzon has in a manner proclaimed that the English has no right to remain in India but by the force of arms." Majumdar further tells us that "the English press in India (*The Englishman, The Statesman, The Pioneer, The Capital*) at first strongly condemned this measure. Practically, the whole Civil Service of Bengal was hostile to the scheme and condemned it as the most unsuitable for the province, injurious to the British administration and financially wasteful . . . . the High Court of Calcutta was definitely against the partition and characterised it as a retrograde and mischievous step. The partition was also strongly condemned by some papers in England." (pp. 7, 9, 10, vol. II).

Dr. Hamid, the modern Pakistani historian, thus sums up the Hindu reaction: "Hindu Bengal was aflame at the birth of new province. Surendranath Bannerjee, the 'trumpeter' of the anti-partition movement, has recorded that the announcement fell like a bombshell. 'We felt that we had been insulted, humiliated and tricked." The sixteenth of October was observed as a day of national mourning in Calcutta and the Hindus wore black ribbons and covered their heads with ashes. They suspended business and went without food and drink, while thousands thronged the streets of Calcutta and marched towards the river to have their devotional

dip, rending the air with their bellicose cries as they went. In the evening, a huge public meeting was held at which the leaders took a vow to undo the dismemberment of their province . . . . Patriotic fury vented itself, first of all, in the boycott of British goods, or Swadeshi as it was called. (Swadeshi literally means nationally produced goods.) Surendranath Bannerjee has left an animated account of these Swadeshi days wherein he describes that Swadeshi became for the people of Bengal a veritable religion. Households discarded the use of all foreign wares and English goods wherever found, were promptly seized and publicly burnt. Students, who were found in the vanguard of the movement, assaulted any fellow student wearing clothes made of foreign material and refused to answer examination questions on imported paper. Patients in the hospitals were even heard to curse English drugs in their delirium. The poet Tagore went further and suggested a boycott of Calcutta University. . . . The Indian National Congress declared the boycott to be the only answer to the partition but ruled that it was to be confined to Bengal alone. Bengali leaders made ineffective appeals to the British Parliament and an association of Hindu merchant princes was constantly pressing the Manchester Chamber of Commerce to have the partition rescinded if they wanted to sell their goods." (pp. 54, 56).

It was not a freedom struggle. It aimed at only the annulment of the partition of Bengal, so that the Muslims be deprived of the only province where they were in effective majority. The movement was directed against Muslims. Valentine Chirol in his book "The Indian Unrest" (1910) says that the appeal of the Hindu press was to the Hindu scriptures and the Hindu deities—"calumny and abuse, combined with a wealth of sacred imagery".

Sedition Committee Report of 1918 also provides some data. It says: "The agitation was Hindu and drew its strength from *bhadralok* (respectable people). It was keenly resented by the Muslims, who form the majority of the inhabitants of Eastern Bengal; and thus throughout the year 1906-07, Hindu and Muslim relations were exceedingly strained in that province." To undo the partition, an organisation named "ANUSILAN SAMITI"

was set up with the main offices in Calcutta and Dacca. At one time the Dacca office controlled five hundred branches in the villages and towns of East Bengal. There also emerged a terrorist movement that concentrated its activities in East Bengal. Its members worked underground, threw bombs on government buildings and shot dead a number of officers. The figures of terrorist incidents showed a progressive upward trend as is evident from the following: 1906: 2; 1907: 7; 1908: 21; 1909: 16; 1910: 9; 1911: 16. (pp. 14-16).

Thus there was a multi-pronged pressure exerted against the British for the annulment of the partition—from the Indian National Congress, chauvinist Hindu organizations and the press, the Anusilan Samiti, the trading community and the terrorist organizations.

In 1911 came the shock. The partition of Bengal was revoked by a royal proclamation. This was a clear betrayal of Muslim interest. Even Lord Minto said in the House of Lords: "We told the Mussalmans that the partition was a settled fact and over and over asserted that it must continue to be so. We assured the Mussulman population of Eastern Bengal of our appreciation of their loyalty and our determination to safeguard their interests. I should think there could have been scarcely a civil servant in India who had not declared that it would be impossible for the British Government to reverse the decision it had come to as regards the partition of Bengal."

The transfer of the Indian capital from Calcutta to Delhi and the decision to establish a university at Dacca were presented to Muslims as compensation for the annulment of partition and H.H. The Aga Khan III, a loyalist Muslim leader in the course of an article entitled "The Recent Changes and the Mussalmans" welcomed the transfer of capital to Delhi for "it will have the great advantage for Mussalmans of bringing the Government of India nearer to the centres of Muslem intellectual activity and to the most virile portions of the Muslim community in India". He supported the annulment of partition on the plea that the Bengali resentment had been set at rest and the Muslims had been promised a university at Dacca. However, the general Muslim reaction was

not so tame as represented by the article of the Aga Khan. Maulana Muhammad Ali wrote a series of editorials in his journal "The Comrade", condemning the annulment decision in no uncertain terms. He said: " . . . . it will not be possible to discover in history a more ignoble instance of rewarding loyalty with deprivation of recently recovered rights and punishing contentment as the worst of crimes." Pathetically he observed: "As for the Mussulmans of Eastern Bengal, they must derive what cold comfort they can from the well-known lines:

> Laugh, and the world laughs with you;
>
> Weep and you weep alone.

After all they are only 'loyal and contented', and as a reward of their loyalty and contentment they have been given a generous helping of the humble pie. We pray that they may not have a too acute attack of indigestion."

Strong resentment was expressed by Nawab Salimullah of Dacca, in the course of his presidential address to the sixth annual session of the All India Muslim League. He said: "The partition gave us a great opportunity to bestir ourselves and it awakened in our hearts the throbbings of a new national life which went pulsating through the various sections of our community in Eastern Bengal . . . . We felt sure that the people of East Bengal, particularly the Muslims, would be immensely benefited by a sympathetic administration, easily accessible to them, and always ready to devote its time and attention exclusively to their welfare . . . . Our ill-wishers at once perceived that the partition would necessarily bring to the fore the long neglected claims of the Muslims of East Bengal: and though we never got more than what was justly our due, what little we gained was so much loss to them. . . . The annulment of partition . . . . has appeared to put a premium on sedition and disloyalty, and created an impression in the minds of the irresponsible masses that even the Government could be brought down to its knees by a reckless and persistent defiance of constituted authority. Moreover it has discredited British rule to an extent which is deeply to be regretted."

To pacify the Nawab of Dacca, the title of G.C.I.E. was conferred on him and he was bold enough to declare that it was "a halter of disgrace around his neck". By the way an opposition member questioned the Government in the British Parliament as to why the title of G.C.I.E. was conferred on the Nawab of Dacca who was a landlord while the title till then was reserved for the princes. The Government reply came that the title was neither a compliment nor an appreciation but a halter round the neck of Sir Salimullah.

The battle was lost in so far as the immediate objective was concerned; but in a way it was not lost, for the Muslims realised that loyalty alone did not count. There emerged a new set of young political leaders like Muhammad Ali, Shaukat Ali, Dr. Ansari, Abul Kalam Azad, Hasrat Mohani and Zafar Ali Khan who through the press and platform set the ball rolling in the direction of a full scale battle for the freedom of the country from the foreign yoke; and particularly the Muslims struggled not only for their own emancipation but also for the liberation of the Muslim world. It was the widespread disillusionment caused by the annulment of partition coupled with the imperialist machinations for the liquidation of the freedom of the Muslim countries that served as an eye-opener for the Muslims, and within a decade they were able to launch the Khilafat and Non-Cooperation Movements, which, though not successful, shook the very foundations of the British colonialism in the subcontinent and within a quarter of a century they were able to achieve Pakistan.

SEPARATE ELECTORATES AND THE TWO-NATION THEORY

SIR Syed Ahmad Khan believed that India was a continent, not a country, and that among the vast population of different races and different creeds, Hindus and Muslims were the two major nations on the basis of nationality, religion, ways of living, customs, mores, culture and historical conditions. Further, he contended that Muslims could not accept a democratic system of Western type because with a one to four ratio of population, they would be enslaved by the Hindus.

An analysis of the cause pleaded by the Hindu chauvinist movements, their leaders and intellectuals amply demonstrates that they considered Hindus as a nation in every sense of the term. They recognised fundamental differences between the Hindus and the Muslims in culture, traditions and history. What they aimed at was the conversion of Muslims to Hinduism, so that a more homogeneous nation could come into being. They did not visualise any sharing of the political power with the Muslims. The Congress for sometime did plead for Indian Nationalism without distinction of caste, creed or colour but the role played by it in the movement for the annulment of the partition of Bengal brought it virtually in line with the chauvinist elements among the Hindus.

As constitutional reforms were in the offing and some sort of democracy was to be introduced, the Hindus thought on the lines of enslaving the Muslims, while the Muslims aimed at maintaining their national identity and attaining a position in future political set-up fully commensurate with their status. They envisaged a bi-national India in which both Hindus and Muslims could thrive side by side. How that bi-national India could come into being had also been under the consideration of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan

as once he had offered to join the Congress in case it agreed to parity in Hindu-Muslim representation in the legislatures and local bodies throughout the subcontinent. Another solution was presented by the Simla Deputation to Lord Minto, the Governor-General of India, in October 1906. The first two demands were as follows:

(i) The electoral system for the elective bodies should be such as to provide for the right of the Muslims to elect their own representatives from special constituencies.

(ii) Keeping in view their historical importance and political position, the Muslims should be given more seats than are warranted by their population strength.

The political situation was unique in the sense that two nations had to live in one subcontinent under one government. Therefore, the solution offered had also to be unique. In every democratic country of the world, the constituencies were territorial. Here in the subcontinent, the principle of separate electorate was proposed envisaging constituencies based on territorial as well as religious grounds. It envisaged separate Muslim constituencies from which only Muslim candidates could seek election and only Muslim voters could exercise their right of franchise. Many arguments were advanced by the Simla Deputation in its support but the principal reason behind the demand was the maintenance of the separate identity of the Muslim Nationhood. The second demand adds weight to this theory because it envisaged more representation than warranted by their population on the basis of "the historical importance and political position" of the Muslim nation. In support of that the Deputation advanced the argument that the Muslim community in India "more numerous than the entire population of any first class European power except Russia" was firstly entitled to "adequate recognition as an important factor in the State". It was further pointed out that the Muslim position "in any kind of representation, direct or indirect, and in all other ways affecting their status and influence, should be commensurate, not merely with their numerical strength, but also with their political importance and the value of their contribution which they make

to the defence of the Empire". Lastly the Governor-General was warned in the following words: ". . . . representative institutions of the European type are new to the Indian people; . . . . the greatest care, fore-thought and caution will be necessary if they are to be successfully adopted to the social, religious and political conditions obtaining in India, and that in the absence of such care and caution their adoption is likely, among other evils, to place our national interests at the mercy of the unsympathetic majority".

The Governor-General, Lord Minto, remained silent on the second demand, but conceded the first one in the following words: "I am as firmly convinced as I believe you to be that any electoral representation in India would be deemed to mischievous failure which aimed at granting a personal enfranchisement, regardless of the belief and traditions of the communities comprising the population of this continent." That set the ball rolling in the direction of the Pakistan Movement, as Pakistan was the logical outcome of Separate Electorates.

In December 1906, the All India Muslim League was established. In his introductory speech to the first session in Dacca, Nawab Vaqar-ul-Mulk said: "The Muslims are only one-fourth of the population of other nations of India. It is quite obvious that, if at any time the British Government ceases to exist, the nation which is four times more numerous, will rule the country. Now, gentlemen, everyone should ponder as to what would be our condition at that time. In such a contingency our lives, our property, our honour, our religion, all will be in jeopardy. Today when the might of the British Government affords protection to the people, there are numerous instances of the difficulties and troubles we experience at the hands of our neighbours in the various provinces. Woe betide the time when we have to live as subjects of these people who want to take revenge of Aurangzeb from us after hundreds of years."

The two-nation theory, separate electorates and weightage (more representation than that warranted by the population) for Muslims remained the sheet-anchor of Muslim League policy

till the late thirties, after which the faith in the concept of a bi-national state disappeared and the Muslims launched the struggle for establishing a Muslim National State or States consisting of the contiguous Muslim majority regions in the north-west and north-east of India.

The bulk of Hindu leadership was opposed to the idea of a bi-national state as expressed in the principle of Separate Electorates, but there were some leaders of eminence who adopted a realistic attitude. Among them was Mr. S. P. Sinha, who, in his presidential address in one of the sessions of the Congress, said: "I am strongly in favour of provision being made for the separate representation of the Mussulmans to an extent which will enable them to be adequately represented on the Legislative Councils, regard being had to their numerical proportion, their influence and their position in each province of the country at large." (quoted by Noman, p. 109). Similarly, Gokhale, the well-known leader, who was very much liked by the Quaid-i-Azam, observed: "Confronted by an overwhelming Hindu majority, Muslims are naturally afraid that release from the British yoke might in their case mean enslavement by the Hindus. This is not a fear to be ridiculed. Were the Hindus similarly situated in regard to number and other things, would they not have entertained similar misgivings? We would have undoubtedly felt the same fear and adopted the identical policy which the Muslims are adopting today." (Quoted by the Quaid-i-Azam at Delhi Session of the Muslim League in 1942.)

The most surprising comment came from Bipin Chandra Pal, the erstwhile exponent of Hindu Nationalism, who in 1909 pleaded for not only a bi-national but a multi-national state. The literary-*cum*-political magazine "Urdu-i-Mualla" edited and owned by Hasrat Mohani published in its issue, dated November 1909, an article by Pal on Hindu-Muslim problem of which the following is an extract: "The Indian patriots shall anyhow have to solve this problem. Hindus shall have to admit that in the general life of the Indian Empire, Muslims are at par with them. The Muslims too shall have to eliminate from their minds the obsession for separation and the superiority complex and they will have to accept

their legitimate area as a part of the Indian Nation of Nations (a nation comprising many nationalities). We shall have to face this difficulty. We may postpone it for some time but it is impossible to close our eyes to it for all time to come. The best way is to settle this issue while the mighty power of the British exists because its presence would prevent bloodshed between the two nations." (translated from Urdu).

Mohammad Ali, a product of the Aligarh Movement, who was a leading figure in all Muslim movements of the second and third decades of this century, had his own idea of the two-nation theory which would have developed into an idea for a separate homeland for the Indian Mussulmans. For a proper assessment of his political thought, it is essential to study his incomplete autobiography and to scan through the pages of "The Comrade" which was an outstanding journal edited and produced by him.

Mohammad Ali had no faith in a united India. He visualised a Federation of Faiths which he explains thus in "My life: A Fragment": "I had long been convinced that here in this country of hundreds of millions of human beings, intensely attached to religion and yet infinitely split up into communities, sects and denominations, Providence had created for us the mission of solving a unique problem and working out a new synthesis. It was nothing less than a Federation of Faiths. The lines of cleavage were too deeply marked to permit a unity other than federal and yet the cleavage was not territorial or racial in character but religious, and I had been dreaming for some time dreams of a 'United Faiths of India'. The Comrade was to be the organ that was to voice these views . . . ." (p. 46).

"We have no faith in the cry that India is united", wrote Mohammad Ali in the first issue of the journal, "The Comrade". "The problems of India are almost international", he added. "However, with mutual goodwill, an Indian nationality could be created which he explained in the following: 'We may not create today the patriotic fervour and the fine national frenzy of Japan with its forty million homogeneous people. But a concordat like

that of Canada is not beyond the bounds of practicability. It may not be a love marriage, born of romance and poetry. But a *marreage de convenance*, honourably contracted and honourably maintained, is not to be despised'." (Vol. I, January 14, 1911).

After two weeks, Mohammad Ali, in an editorial entitled "Separate Electorate" explained his earlier statement to the effect that the problems of India were international rather than national. He wrote: ". . . . the problems of India are not so national as international. And in international law, the strength of a country or Power does not count, for the basic principle of that law is the equality of all nations. The Mussulmans stand on par with the smaller powers of Europe, and can even claim like those Powers an absolute equality in all inter-communal controversies. But they do not do so, and limit their demand to such a representation as is adequate and effective for the preservation of their existence and their honour." (Vol. I, No. 3, January 28, 1911).

A year after that, Mohammad Ali made this candid remark in an editorial: ". . . . a united India does not exist today. We have to create it, and the first necessary condition, before it can be created, is to recognise that it does not exist." (Vol. 3, No. 1, January 6, 1912).

That brings us to the conclusion that according to Mohammad Ali, a united India did not exist, that the Muslims constituted a separate nation at par with small European Powers, that it was only a strategy to try a *marreage de convenance* with the obvious corollary that the ties of marriage could be broken if it was found that the marriage could not be honourably maintained.

Another step towards the establishment of a bi-national state was taken in 1916 when the Congress and the Muslim League entered into Lucknow Pact, an agreed plan with regard to the political and constitutional future of India. Credit for that goes solely to the Quaid-i-Azam, who holding the dual membership of the Congress and the Muslim League, was in a position to act as an apostle of Hindu-Muslim Unity. The significance of the Lucknow Pact lies in the fact that all opposition to the Separate

Electorates ceased as it became an agreed demand of the Congress as well as the League. Muslims were given weightage in the Central Legislature and were given the right to veto any bill or resolution introduced by a non-official member that adversely affected their interests. Although there were many aspects of the Pact which were rather injurious to the interests of the Muslims but the Congress acceptance of the separate electorates, weightage and the right to veto any adverse resolution proved once for all that there existed two nations in the country.

The Hindu-Muslim honeymoon lasted for about seven years. During that period they acted in unison on various political issues and fought shoulder to shoulder with each other in the Non-Co-operation and Khilafat Movements. However, a few months after M. K. Gandhi called off the movement, the resurgence of Hindu chauvinism forced the Congress to back out from the Lucknow Pact and sponsor a new plan for the constitutional future of India. That Plan was generally known as the Nehru Report after Pandit Moti Lal Nehru, who was the Chairman of the Committee. The Nehru Report did not concede the separate electorates and also withdrew some other concessions given to Muslims under the Lucknow Pact. It was in fact based on a one-nation India, and, therefore, it was rejected by the Muslims.

The Muslims, therefore, had no other course open than to formulate their demands afresh. That led to the holding of an All-Parties Muslim Conference in 1929 in which all possible groups, parties and interests were represented. The Conference, presided over by the Aga Khan III, formulated the Muslim national demands, later known as "Jinnah's Fourteen Points". It envisaged the following demands:

1. Federal form of government with residuary powers vested in provinces.
2. Uniform measure of provincial autonomy.
3. Adequate and effective representation to minorities in all legislatures without reducing the majority in any province to a minority or even equality.

4. One-third Muslim representation in the Central Legislature.

5. Separate Electorates.

6. Any territorial redistribution should not affect the Muslim majority in the Punjab and Bengal.

7. Full religious liberty to all communities.

8. No bill or resolution should be passed in a legislature without the concurrence of the three-fourth majority of a community whom it affects.

9. Separation of Sind from Bombay Presidency.

10. Introduction of constitutional reforms in N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan.

11. Adequate constitutional safeguards for the protection of Muslim culture, education, language, religion, personal laws and Muslim charitable institutions.

12. Adequate Muslim share in services.

13. No cabinet, either central or provincial, should be formed without there being a proportion of at least one-third Muslim ministers.

14. No change in the constitution by the Central Legislature without the concurrence of the States constituting the Indian Federation.

The purpose behind the Fourteen Points was to have a bi-national but loose federation of five Muslim and six Hindu states, enjoying full autonomy and retaining the residuary powers. Secondly, the balance was meant to be strengthened through one-third representation in the federal legislature and cabinet as well as in the Hindu states' cabinets. Thirdly, it aimed at ensuring that no adverse legislation was enacted and no arbitrary change was made in the constitution. Thus a highly balanced bi-national political system was envisaged, in which the two nations could co-exist without fear of the domination of one by the other.

PROPOSALS FOR PARTITION OF THE SUBCONTINENT

WHILE the Muslim leadership stood divided on the question of the political future of Muslims—one group standing for merging their identity into an Indian nation and nurturing the fond hope of a fair deal from the Hindu majority, and the other, the larger one seeking the establishment of a bi-national federal state maintaining a balance between the two nations through separate electorates, weightage based on the political and historical importance of the Muslims and the establishment of five Muslim-majority provinces as well as through effective guarantees; there existed some individuals including journalists, politicians and lesser political workers, who made pointers in the direction of partitioning the subcontinent in order to create one or more independent and sovereign Muslim states. As their opinions help us in tracing the origin of Pakistan, it seems imperative to recount them in brief.

Abdul Halim Sharar

Abdul Halim Sharar was an eminent scholar and novelist who rarely entered the domain of politics. In 1890, he started "Muhazzib", a weekly paper devoted to history, literature and social affairs with a sprinkling of political comments made in the editorial columns. A file of that forms part of the author's collection of rare newspaper files gifted to the Lahore Museum. In that paper, Sharar frequently made comments on Hindu-Muslim riots. In one of the editorial notes published in the issue dated August 23, 1890, he wrote: "Times are such that the religious rites of one nation cannot be performed without injuring the susceptibilities of the other. Nor is there the element of patience to ignore insults. If things have reached such a stage, it would be wise on the part

of Hindus and Muslims to separate their provinces and exchange the population. The Hindus seem to be of the view that they should not allow Muslims to be their neighbours. Neither do they like to convey the jingle of their temple gongs to the Muslim infidels nor they themselves like to hear the *Azan* (Muslim call to prayer). Surely this position would be acceptable to Muslims because they too, seem to be tired of Hindus."

Vilayat Ali "Bambooque"

In Maulana Mohammad Ali's first class English-language weekly, "The Comrade", there used to appear a permanent humorous feature named "Gup". Among those who wrote this feature, the name of Vilayat Ali Bambooque stands high. A lawyer by profession, he was a fine humorist with Bambooque as his pen name. In the issue dated May 10, 1913, he contributed to the "Gup" column a light essay entitled "The Interview". It was an imaginary interview with "a gentleman who owns dubious brains but refreshingly original views". The following is an extract :

Q. How would you solve the Hindu-Muslim problem?

A. The Hindus and Muslims should be segregated—Northern India to be assigned to the Muslims and the rest to the Hindus. (When it was pointed out to the gentleman that unenlightened opinion, deriving support from the vulgarity of census records, did not consider his classification of Indian population to be exhaustive, he added readily but without any compunction: "The Sikhs and Jains and other castes and creeds will go with the Hindus".) (Vol. 5; No. 18, May 10, 1913: p. 380).

This proposal, though made in a lighter vein is strikingly similar to the one made by William Scawen Blunt in 1883 to the effect that all the provinces of Northern India should be placed under Muslim Government and those of Southern India under Hindu Government. Moreover, it is very likely that Bambooque had received the tip from Mohammad Ali, because he himself held the view that the Hindu-Muslim problem was an international rather than a national problem and that Muslims could demand its solution under the International Law.

Kheiri Brothers

Originally, it was Maulana Ghulam Rasul Mehr, the well-known journalist and historian, who told the author that at the Stockholm Conference of Socialist International held in 1917, the Kheiri brothers—Dr. Abdul Jabbar Kheiri and Professor Abdus Sattar Kheiri—made a proposal for the partition of India into Muslim and Hindu Indias. Maulana Mehr even claimed to possess a clipping of those days from one of the important English-language dailies of the subcontinent, but unfortunately could not trace out the same from his disorganised collection of thousands of documents. Therefore, the author has no other course open to him than to depend upon the data provided by Mr. Sharifuddin Pirzada in his book "Evolution of Pakistan". The data does not contain the details of the proposal, but it does include the full text of the correspondence Prof. Abdus Sattar Kheiri had in 1941 with Mr. C. R. Attlee, then Lord Privy Seal and with M. Comille Huysmans, President, Socialist International. Prof. Kheiri firstly sought a confirmation of the fact that he and his brother made such a proposal and secondly wanted him to confirm that the proposal was not made under British influence. In this connection, Mr. Huysmans' reply to Mr. Attlee contains the following: "I remember very well their visit and in my book on the Stockholm Conference, published in the beginning of 1918, at Upsale in French language, with the title Stockholm, you will find, pages 407-408, a summary of the report of a Central Committee of Muslims . . . . they suggested in 1917, in their full text, partition of India into a Muslim India and a Hindu India. As they write also, I seemed surprised with their ideas, at the moment, but not so surprised as the two delegates think; as this idea was so strongly connected with some of our own political solutions in Europe. The very aggressive tone of the statement proves that it is childish to suppose any British influence in the matter." (p. 89).

Abdul Qadir Bilgrami

Dr. Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi writes in his book "The Struggle for Pakistan": "In March and April 1920, the 'Dhul Qarnain'

of Badaun published an open letter from one Muhammad Abdul Qadir Bilgrami to Gandhi advocating partition of the subcontinent, in which he gave even a list of the Muslim districts, which is, generally speaking, not too different from the present boundaries of East and West Pakistan. These letters seem to have attracted some notice because they were later published in the form of a pamphlet which ran into two editions. The second edition is dated December, 1925." (p. 118).

Nadir Ali

Khaliquzzaman, in his "Pathway to Pakistan", writes: "In 1921, a local lawyer of Agra, Mr. Nadir Ali, who was a great admirer of the British and was violently opposed to Khilafat Movement, wrote a pamphlet in which as one of the methods of settlement of the Hindu-Muslim problem, he discussed partition of India." (p. 238).

Sardar Gul Khan

In 1923, the Government of India appointed a North-West Frontier Committee under the Chairmanship of Sir Dennis Bray. The assignment was to report on the administrative relationship between the Settled Districts of the N.W.F.P. and the Tribal Area and on the question of amalgamating the N.W.F.P. with the Punjab. The Report was published in 1924. The following extract from the minority report of Mr. N. M. Samarth is of particular interest to us: "There was before the Committee another witness (Sardar Gul Khan) who could claim to speak with the authority of personal knowledge and experience of not only the North West Frontier Province and independent territory but Baluchistan, Persia and Afghanistan, which this witness could justly lay claim to. It is noteworthy that he appeared before the Committee as a witness in his capacity as 'President, Islamic Anjuman, Dera Ismail Khan".

Q. The idea at the back of your Anjuman is the pan-Islamic idea which is that Islam is a League of Nations and as such amalgamating this (Frontier Province) with the Punjab will be detrimental,

will be prejudicial to that idea. That is the dominant idea at the back of those who think with you? Is it so?

A. It is so, but I have to add something. Their idea is that the Hindu-Muslim unity will never become a fact, it will never become a *fait accompli* and they think that this province should remain separate and a link between Islam and Britannic Commonwealth. In fact, when I am asked what my opinion is—I, as a member of the Anjuman, am expressing this opinion—we would very much rather see the separation of the Hindus and the Muslims, 23 crores of Hindus to the South and 8 crores of Muslims to the North. Give the whole portion from RASKUMARI (Cape Comorin) to Agra to Hindus and from Agra to Peshawar to Muslims—I mean trans-migration from one place to the other. This is an idea of exchange. It is not an idea of annihilation". (Quoted by Pirzada, pp. 95-96).

Hasrat Mohani

Maulana Hasrat Mohani was, as early as 1921, conscious of the existence of Muslim-majority provinces as a balancing factor in a bi-national India. In his presidential address to the All India Muslim League session at Ahmadabad, he said: " . . . . while the Mussalmans as a whole, are in a minority in India; yet nature has provided a compensation; the Mussalmans are not in a minority in all the provinces. In some provinces such as Kashmir, the Punjab, Sind, Bengal and Assam, the Mussalmans are more numerous than the Hindus. In the 'United States of India' the Hindu majority in Madras, Bombay and the U.P. will not be allowed to overstep the limits of moderation against the Mussalmans". (Foundations of Pakistan, p. 559).

In 1924, he made the following proposals to the Hindus:

(a) to recognise the bi-communal basis of the future Independent State;

(b) to convert the Muslim-majority provinces into Muslim States and the Hindu-majority provinces into Hindu States; and

(c) to create an Indian Federation of these States and place it under a Supreme National Government composed of Hindus and Muslims. (Quoted by Rahmat Ali, in *Pakistan*, p. 216).

It was not a plan for partition of the subcontinent for he visualised a bi-national Supreme Government, but we have given it in this chapter because it provoked Lala Lajpat Rai, the veteran Hindu leader to propose a formula of total partition.

Lala Lajpat Rai

Towards the end of 1924, Lala Lajpat Rai, wrote a series of articles entitled "From Ravi to Brahmaputra" in a number of leading English-language dailies. In the concluding article he presented his thesis in the following words: "Let those who demand communal representation with separate electorates in all the representative institutions of the land, honestly confess that they do not believe in nationalism or in a united India. The two things are absolutely irreconcilable. Mr. M. A. Jinnah is the latest recruit to this party, and I really cannot understand how he calls himself a nationalist still. The euphemism that this is only tentative and that a time will come when the Muslims will be ready to give up communal representation should deceive no one. Once you accept communal representation with separate electorates, there is no chance of its being ever abolished, without a civil war. A civil war will, again, actually mean supremacy of one community over the other. This lends weight to the fear entertained by some Hindus that some, at least, of the Muslim leaders are counting on the help of foreign Muslim States to establish Muslim rule throughout Hindustan. Whether this fear is or is not well-founded, it is only natural that those who entertain it should oppose communal representation with all the strength they can command.

"My suggestion is that the Punjab should be partitioned into two provinces, the Western Punjab with a large Muslim majority to be Muslim-governed province; and the Eastern Punjab with a large Hindu-Sikh majority to be non-Muslim governed province. I do not discuss Bengal. To me it is unimaginable that the rich and

highly progressive and alive Hindus of Bengal will ever work out the pact agreed to by Mr. Das (Mr. C. R. Das). I will make the same suggestion in their case, but if Bengal is prepared to accept Mr. Das's Pact, I have nothing to say. It is its own outlook.

"Maulana Hasrat Mohani has recently said that the Muslims will never agree to India's having Dominion Status under the British. What they aim at are separate Muslim States in India united with Hindu States under a National Federal Government. He is also in favour of smaller states containing compact Hindu and Muslim populations. If communal representation with separate electorates is to be the rule, then Maulana Hasrat Mohani's scheme seems to be the only workable proposition. Under my scheme the Muslims will have four Muslim States: (1) the Pathan province or the North-West Frontier; (2) Western Punjab; (3) Sind; and (4) Eastern Bengal. If there are compact Muslim communities in any other part of India, sufficiently large to form a province, they should be similarly constituted. But it should distinctly be understood that this is not a united India. It means a clear partition of India into a Muslim India and a non-Muslim India". (Quoted by M. H. Saiyid, pp. 327-30).

This clear-cut thinking on the part of Lala Lajpat Rai was made possible because of his firm belief that Hindus and Muslims were two separate nations and a merger between the two was an impossibility. During these very days, in the course of a letter sent to Mr. C. R. Das, he wrote: "I have devoted most of my time during the last six months to the study of Muslim history and Muslim law and I am inclined to think that it (Hindu-Muslim unity) is neither possible nor practicable". (Saiyid, p. 334).

Mohammad Ali

As already pointed out, Mohammad Ali was a firm believer in the two-nation theory. He considered Hindu-Muslim problem as international rather than national but was agreeable to the formation of a concordat like that of Canada and said: "It may not be a love marriage born of romance and poetry. But a *marreage de convenance,* honourably contracted and honourably maintained,

is not to be despised." Throughout his life he believed in a bi-national Indian Federation based on a marriage of convenience between the two nations. However, at certain occasions he did imply that partition would be the ultimate solution. Khaliquzzaman is responsible for the statement that in 1924 "Maulana Mohammad Ali, in one of his speeches at Aligarh, said: 'if the Hindu-Muslim problem is not settled, India will be divided into Hindu India and Muslim India'." (p. 238). Similarly, when the report of the Frontier Inquiry Committee was published, the partition of India proposed by Sardar Gul Khan, though characterised by him as "a proposal of some Muslim madcap" brought forth the following significant comment in the *Comrade* dated June 5, 1925: "If this partition was practicable, instead of this suggestion being an indication of the treachery harboured by Muslims against their Hindu neighbours and of the probability of their letting in and assisting a foreign power beyond our frontiers to conquer India, it would rather be an indication that Mussalmans had no desire to rule over Hindus to whom they were willing to consign the whole of India from Agra to Cape Comorin. Is that not exactly what the Turkish exchange of population indicates? The Turks were sick of foreign intervention in their affairs on the pretext of securing justice for Christian minorities in Turkey, and in their exasperation they said to Europe: "We don't want to rule over your Christian minorities. Take them and be done with it. Let us have in exchange the Muslim minorities in Greece, and after that let us develop such area as is left to us; and let other Christian States in the Balkans develop such areas as they have." Turkey had despaired of Christian and Muslim unity as some Hindus and Mussalmans despair of Hindu and Muslim unity. But that despair was anything but indicative of a desire to conquer territories inhabited exclusively by Christians."

"An Indian Muslim"

In 1928, there appeared a book, "The Indian Muslims", by an Indian Muslim (Ardene Publishers, London) from which Pirzada gives the following quotation: "Within the frontiers of India live two nations, the Muslim and the Hindu, which entertain for each other the same feelings as do, for instance, French and Germans,

and who differ from one another more profoundly than any nations in Europe . . . . This is the fundamental fact on which Indian society is based, and any constitution which is not founded on it will come to the ground." (p. 119).

Murtaza Ahmad Khan Maikash

Maulana Murtaza Ahmad Khan "Maikash" was in the late twenties a senior member of the editorial staff of the daily 'Inqilab' of Lahore. He wrote a series of three articles in that paper during December, 1928. The first entitled "Collective political life of Indian Muslims: painful demonstration of the anarchy of thought and action", published on December 7, deplored the disunity in the Muslim ranks which was attributed to lack of a specific goal before the nation. The second, entitled "Political objective of Indian Muslims", published on December 8, after an analysis of the political situation, urged upon the Muslims to adopt their goal the establishment of a Muslim national homeland based on the right of self-determination and made an appeal to the All Parties Muslim Conference to give serious consideration to that proposal. The third, which appeared on December 9, was entitled "Indian Muslims' Need for a Homeland: the only solution of India's Political Tangles". In this article it was stated that the contiguous territory comprising the Punjab, N.W.F.P., Sind and Baluchistan could serve as a ready-made homeland for the Indian Muslims where they could mould and develop their civilization, their thought, their culture and their society.

"Pratap", a very important Hindu daily of Lahore, strongly opposed the proposal and said that Muslims wanted to carve out an Islamistan from this Kafiristan (land of the infidels) and further opined that the concessions expected from the Hindus were bound to be used against them. Maulana Maikash in his rejoinder published in the "Inqilab" dated December 19, 1928, said that if the principle of the right of self-determination could be applied in Europe, why could it not be applied to the Muslims of the subcontinent.

The author learned from his father, the late Maulana Abdul Majid Salik, who was the editor of the "Inqilab", that

the articles were published at the behest of Dr. Muhammad Iqbal, who wanted to gauge Hindu reaction to his plan for the establishment of a Muslim National State in the North-West of India.

Fazal Karim Khan Durrani

Mr. F. K. Khan Durrani, who first acted as a missionary and then edited a couple of English language weeklies, had close relations with Dr. Muhammad Iqbal. Receiving inspiration from Iqbal, he made the following observation in the last chapter of his book entitled "The Future of Islam in India": "For years and years I have been cherishing a dream and the time has come that I should put it before my brethren. It is the dream of a Muslim India. I have never been a believer in the Hindu-Muslim unity. At a time when the whole of India was going mad over it, I rejected it as unthinkable, and events that have happened in India during the last ten years have made it plain for all who have eyes to see that the dream of a Muslim India is the only alternative that has been left for the Muslims of this country. The Hindus have declared a war of extirpation upon us. It is unreasonable to get angry over it. They could not do otherwise even if they wished to. It is the unavoidable result of the newly-born political consciousness. Two mutually inimical cultures cannot exist side by side without a clash and the two communities equally conscious of their separate political identities must sooner or later come to blows. The history of the church-states existing side by side with the secular states in Europe in the Middle Ages shows that an imperium within an imperium is an unnatural condition which must end in the destruction of one or the other. The idea of unity as a solution of India's problem is an unutterable folly, against which the history of the world stands as a witness. States have never been born of pacts, and the people of India are not so extraordinarily wonderful that they should be able to achieve what the world has never been able to achieve. The idea of unity is based upon ignorance of the national characteristics of the two people. It is based upon ignorance of the very rudiments of political philosophy. The true solution of India's problem is elimination of one of the two elements. Either the Muslims should commit suicide and remove themselves from

the stage (or grow tufts of hair on their heads and become Hindus, which means the same thing) or assert themselves like Muslims and make a bid for the empire of India. There is no other alternative."

RESURGENCE OF HINDU NATIONALISM

THE Hindu-Muslim honeymoon came to an abrupt end immediately after the Non-Cooperation Movement was called off. In the years that followed, the bulk of Muslim leadership continued its endeavours for a new understanding between the Hindus and the Muslims. No doubt, a few Muslim workers and politicians made stray proposals for the partition of the sub-continent, but the main stream of Muslim politics was still directed at the concept of a bi-national Indian Federation in which Muslims could have a secure position. On the other hand, Congress efforts were directed at not only dodging the Muslims but also at depriving them of the small advantages conceded to them under the provisions of the Lucknow Pact. Side by side with that emerged a militant movement of Hindu chauvinism that went a step further from the line adopted by the Congress and pleaded for a naked Hindu Raj and the complete annihilation of Islam in the sub-continent.

The brain behind Hindu militancy was that of Mr. Hardyal, a prominent Punjabi Hindu leader, who had earlier made name as a terrorist and as an anarchist, had joined the Ghadr Party and worked for Indian freedom from his base in the United States of America. In 1925, he emerged in true colours. He wrote a book in Hindi language. Its name was "Mere Vichar" (my thoughts) from which copious extracts were published in the Hindu press of the subcontinent. According to him, the term Hindu embraced men belonging to all faiths that emanated from the Indian soil. Thus Sikhs and Jains were Hindus while Muslims, Christians and Parsis were outsiders. He said: "If there is any possibility of the Hindus and the Muslims working together, it is only possible as we see in the Hindu States or as was the usage at the time of

Maharaja Ranjit Singh. It is that the state should belong to the Hindus and Muslims may live there. But the state cannot be a Muslim state nor can it be a jointly Hindu-Muslim administered state. The reason is that every state is ultimately dependent on its customs, its national language and its national history."

In order to ensure "the future of Hindu race, of Hindustan and of the Punjab", Hardyal envisaged a four-point plan, a gist of which is as follows:

1. Hindu *Sangathan*: That Hindus be organized on a separate platform.
2. Hindu *Raj*: That the government and administration shall be exclusively Hindu.
3. *Shuddhi* (purification): That the Muslims of the sub-continent be converted to Hinduism so that a national homogeneity be established.
4. Expansion of Frontiers: That Afghanistan and the tribal belt be conquered and the Muslims inhabiting those areas be converted to Hinduism, so that India's defence could be ensured.

Justifying the plan, Hardyal said: "So long as the Hindu nation does not accomplish these four things, the safety of our children and great-grand-children will be ever in danger, and the safety of the Hindu race will be impossible. The Hindu race has but one history, and its institutions are homogeneous. But the Mussalmans and Christians are far removed from the confines of Hinduism, for their religions are alien and they love Persian, Arab and European institutions. Thus, just as one removes foreign matter from the eye, *Shuddhi* must be made of these two religions. Afghanistan and the hilly regions of the frontier were formerly part of India, but are at present under the domination of Islam . . . . just as there is Hindu religion in Nepal, so there must be Hindu institutions in Afghanistan and the frontier territory; otherwise it is useless to win Swaraj. For mountain tribes are always warlike and hungry. If they become our enemies, the age of Nadir Shah and Zaman Shah will begin anew. At present English officers are

protecting the frontiers; but it cannot always be . . . . If Hindus want to protect themselves, they must conquer Afghanistan and the frontiers and convert all the mountain tribes." (Ambedkar, p. 117). At one time Hardyal was a little "considerate" to Muslims and, therefore, expressed willingness to tolerate them in the sub-continent, but on certain conditions: "they must adopt Hindu names; they must give up names of Arab and Iranian origin; they must observe Hindu festivals; they must revere the Hindu heroes of the epics; they must dress like Hindus; they must observe the Hindu customs; and they must give up calling themselves Muslims. Even then if they choose to follow their religious belief, they could be given the permission to worship in their own manner. They must, however, call themselves Muhammadi Hindus."

One more extract from a writing of Hardyal: "The purpose of the Hindu *Sangathan* is to establish in India a strong, powerful, united and wide-awake political party which would continuously strive for achieving the ideal of a free Hindu state . . . . The Hindu national state should be based on Hindu national institutions. These institutions are, for example, the Sanskrit language; the Hindi language; Hindu history: Hindu festivals; veneration for the Hindu heroes; love for the holy places of the Hindus; love for the Hindu culture, etc. Today, there are some people who quite unnecessarily want to include in the Indian national movement the half-Arab, half-Irani Muslims. They do not understand the truth that every national state is established on its old national institutions, which create unity among them . . . . The Indian Muslims today are merely an irrelevance. Their only future is gradually to be absorbed into Hinduism through *Shuddhi*. The principles of politics show me no other way. Therefore, if the leaders of the Hindu *Sangathan* establish committees for the protection of national institutions and the attainment of Hindu independence, and if they preach the need for organizing all Hindu states into a single state, they can render some service to India." ('Tej', Delhi, Krishna Number, 1926).

Hardyal was not a madcap. His thesis consistently and continuously presented through the powerful Hindu press was, by no

stretch of imagination, the mere emotional outburst of an individual. He was a thinker, an intellectual of repute who made great impact on Hindu thinking in the subcontinent. The All India Hindu Mahasabha and its ancillary para-military organizations were the direct outcome of the impact of his views on the Hindu public opinion. If one scans through the official proceedings of the annual sessions of the Mahasabha during 1924—27 or even after that, one could easily find the source from where the inspiration arrived for a militant anti-Muslim campaign. Dr. Moonje, the well-known Hindu leader in the course of a speech said: "Just as England belongs to the English, France to the French and Germany to the Germans, India belongs to the Hindus.... If the Hindus get organized, they can humble the English and their stooges, the Muslims.... the Hindus henceforth create their own world which will prosper through *Shuddhi* and *Sangathan*." That was the theme harped upon throughout these years by all leaders of the Hindu Mahasabha.

Sangathan and *Shuddhi* were no empty slogans. They were full-fledged and well-organised movements spread over the whole of the subcontinent. *Sangathan* (organisation) materialised in the form of the All India Hindu Mahasabha which became a very active body, so active that it outshone the Congress. Established in early 'twenties and aided by para-military organizations, it challenged the Congress in elections of 1926 and came out with flying colours. Its victory over the 41-year old Indian National Congress amply demonstrated the new aggressive attitude of the Hindu nation. As Dr. Hamid points out "the Congress reeled under the blow and was driven towards conformity with Hindu Mahasabha policies.... The dividing line between the two was almost obliterated". (p. 179). That is why all attempts made for a new Hindu-Muslim understanding failed miserably and what came out of the All-Parties Conferences at Delhi and Bombay was the Nehru Report, a plan for the future constitution of India, which was anti-Muslim with a vengeance. There was to be no separate electorates, no weightage to the minorities, no one-third representation to the Muslims in the Centre. Sind was to be separated only

if found financially viable. Federal form of government was conceded but the residuary powers were to vest in the Centre. Thus *Sangathan* movement was successful and stage was set for the Hindu Raj.

Shuddhi movement was launched with full vigour. It had India-wide dimensions but as Dr. I. H. Qureshi points out in his chapter on "Hindu Communal Movements" to "A History of the Freedom Movement" (Vol. 3, Part I) the greatest efforts for the conversion of the Muslims were made in certain areas of the United Provinces, Punjab and Rajputana. He says: "There was a community of Muslim Rajputs, called Malkanas, who still retained many Hindu usages and customs. They seemed to be an easy target, because they were proud of their Rajput blood and had not been fully assimilated into the Muslim community. The full vigour of the *Shuddhi* Movement was turned upon them and the efforts of the Hindu workers began to bear some fruit. The Muslims responded by sending their own missionaries. The Muslims did lose a fair number of the Malkanas but the others remained not only loyal, but became better adherents of Islam, having given up their un-Islamic customs and ideas. So long as the Arya Samajists had an open field and worked among partially converted Muslims, they had some success; but as soon as they tried to work among communities other than the Malkanas, they could make no headway." (p. 257). As a counter-blast to the *Sangathan* and *Shuddhi*, some Muslims launched the *Tanzeem* and *Tabligh* movements but they did not attract much notice of the bulk of Muslim leadership because they were still under the impression that Hindu chauvinism was a passing phase and ultimately some sort of Hindu-Muslim understanding would be possible.

The Mahasabha politics sharpened Hindu-Muslim conflict to a degree that resulted in wide-spread communal riots throughout the subcontinent, verging on a civil war fought without regular armies. The pattern of Hindu-Muslim riots was like this—sometimes groups armed with lathis, knives, spears and swords fought pitched battles, at other times, a series of stabbing affrays took

place. Cases of loot and arson were also common and when the riots assumed dimensions, kidnapping and rape of women took place. In Bengal alone, from 1923 to 1927 thirty-five thousand women were abducted and innumerable instances of public rape, burning alive, murder and arson were witnessed.

The dimensions of the Hindu-Muslim civil war could be guaged from the following summing up by Dr. Hamid based on the data supplied by Cumming in "Political India".

The first grave outbreak of a new series occurred at Multan .... in September 1922, on the occasion of the Muharram festival and the celebrations in 1923 were marked by serious collisions of which the most formidable occurred at Saharanpur .... where the casualties exceeded 300. The year 1924 had a still blacker record with 18 serious riots, in which 86 persons were killed and 776 wounded. The worst storm centre was Kohat .... where terrible disturbances arose out of the publication of an anti-Islamic poem of Hindu authorship. The roll of two days' casualties amounted to 36 killed and 145 wounded; extensive looting took place in the bazars, and house property valued at Rs. 70,000 was destroyed. The riots were followed by a temporary exodus from the town of the entire Hindu population .... There was some improvement in 1925, but it was short-lived, for all previous records surpassed in 1926, with 36 serious riots and a casualty roll of 2,000. In this year Calcutta took the lead, with disturbances which started over the old trouble of music before mosques and developed into an orgy of murderous attacks of hooligans of both camps. Before peace was finally restored 200 shops were looted, 12 sacred buildings were desecrated or destroyed, there were 150 cases of incendiary fire and 1,450 casualties, including 140 deaths.

".... the tension had now become so great that the most trivial incidents sufficed to start trouble. The demon of unrest was abroad .... and communal disorder had become the dominant factor of Indian political life .... the year 1927 was as black as its predecessor. Thirty-one serious riots occurred with a casualty roll exceeding 1,600 ....

"Communal riots were much less frequent in 1928 than in the two previous years, but between February and May 1929 there occurred serious disturbances in Bombay city, which began with collisions between Hindu strikers and Pathan substitutes, and continued, as in Calcutta three years before, with murderous assaults on individuals, and wholesale looting of shops by the criminal classes. Before the disorder finally subsided, there had been over 1,100 casualties, including nearly two hundred deaths. The significance of these riots was that their proximate cause was economic rather than religious.

". . . . (in) March 1931 . . . . the Cawnpore tragedy shocked the whole of India. In the course of enforced closing of shops, in honour of a Hindu assassin, the Hindus and Muslims of Cawnpore came to blows. This developed into a riot of unprecedented violence and peculiar ferocity . . . . Murders, arson and looting were widespread for three days . . . . The death roll . . . . was probably between four and five hundred . . . . a large number of temples and mosques were desecrated or destroyed, and a very large number of houses were burnt and pillaged . . . ." (p. 162).

Hindu-Muslim riots were not uncommon in the subcontinent. The immediate causes were invariably cow-slaughter, music before mosques and publication of provocative literature against each other, injuring religious susceptibilities. There were economic causes as well, for in Bengal landlords mostly belonged to Hindu religion while peasants were generally Muslims; and in Punjab money-lenders were invariably Hindus, while Muslims were peasant-proprietors depending upon them for credit facilities. The "divide and rule" policy of the British also made its contribution. However, history is a witness to the fact that whenever Hindu chauvinism surged forward, it brought in its wake a wave of riots. Hindu resurgence in the nineteenth century led to communal riots. Hindu opposition to the partition of Bengal was responsible for a fresh wave of riots. And the tempo of riots rose to a new pitch taking the form of a civil war without armies in the twenties because the Hindu nation, in a very organized form, expressed its determination to establish Hindu Raj and to convert Muslims to Hinduism. They

made no bones of their intention, not only to eliminate Muslims from the body-politic of India but to exterminate them altogether. The Congress backed out from the Lucknow Pact and through Nehru Report intended to deprive the Muslims even of a few safeguards provided in 1916. No attention was paid by the Congress to even "Jinnah's Fourteen Points" whose reasonableness could not be denied.

The situation in late twenties could be summed up as follows:

1. The Hindu bid for *Sangathan* and *Shuddhi* proved once for all that a bi-national Indian Federation was an impossibility. The All India Hindu Mahasabha grew stronger and stronger.
2. The Congress succumbed to the Mahasabha pressure and virtually began to follow its line by balking at any attempt to arrive at an understanding with Muslims.
3. The Hindu-Muslim riots assumed dimensions of a virtual civil war.
4. The Muslim League leadership lacked dynamism, stuck to the concept of a bi-national India and could not initiate fresh thinking or a new approach towards solving the problem of the future of Muslims in the subcontinent.

It was Iqbal who attempted at breaking the stalemate and initiating a new thinking.

BACKGROUND OF ALLAHABAD ADDRESS

THAT Iqbal stood for the establishment of a Muslim National State in the North-West of India is known to all, but perhaps very few know that he also advocated the organization of the Muslims of this region on a separate political platform, for he believed that their interests were widely different from those Muslims inhabiting the minority provinces of the subcontinent.

Five weeks before he read the historic address at the Allahabad Session of the All-India Muslim League, he sponsored the idea of convening an Upper India Muslim Conference at Lahore, representing all shades of Muslim political opinion in the Punjab, N.W.F.P., Sind and Baluchistan. Even in June 1937, he proposed the holding of a North-West Indian Muslim Conference.

Before it is examined analytically, it seems necessary to make a brief survey of the political situation that existed at the moment. It was in 1929 that the All Parties Muslim Conference held at Delhi under the chairmanship of the Aga Khan III, of which Dr. Muhammad Iqbal was an ardent votary, passed a resolution formulating Muslim demands regarding the future political set-up of the subcontinent. This resolution, said Iqbal a year later, was wholly inspired by the noble idea of a "Muslim India within India". It envisaged recognition of Muslim majorities in the Punjab and Bengal, separation of Sind from Bombay as a province, introduction of constitutional reforms in N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan, complete provincial autonomy, representation through separate electorate and a ban on legislating on any inter-communal matter without the approval of the three-fourth majority of the concerned community.

Political events took an ominous turn in the course of the next few months. There was a three-pronged attack on Muslim

interests. On the one hand, the Hindus offered a tough opposition and on the other, the Government of India in the course of its observations on the Simon Commission Report ignored the Muslim demands. Yet another tragedy followed. The Muslim delegates to the first Round Table Conference held at London committed a political blunder in watering down the Muslim demands and even accepting joint electorate that killed all chances of Muslims securing majorities in Punjab and Bengal. At this critical juncture, Iqbal realised that the peculiar problems of the Muslims in the North-West could only be understood by the people belonging to this region and that in order to survive they would have to chalk out their own line of action.

How this came about is an interesting story. Iqbal had close relations with the editors of the three Muslim separatist dailies of Lahore, namely, 'Muslim Outlook', "Inqilab" and "Siyasat". First, private consultations took place. Then under Iqbal's inspiration "Inqilab" wrote an editorial calling upon the Muslims of Northern India to hold a conference of their own in order to discuss the problems they faced at the moment. The editorial concluded: "The need for a conference of the Muslims of Northern India was felt since long. However, recent events have made it absolutely necessary. As long as Centre's hold on the provinces is not weakened, constitutional reforms are not introduced in Sind, N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan, and the Muslim majority is not secured in the Punjab through separate electorate, the political existence of the Muslims of Northern India will remain in danger. No doubt, it is the crying need of the hour that Muslims of this region rise to the occasion and decide that practical steps are necessary in order to safeguard their rights in Punjab, Sind, N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan. If they remain inert at this critical moment, they will be sorry for ever." (November 21, 1930).

Forty-eight hours after the publication of the editorial, Dr. Muhammad Iqbal convened a meeting of the leading Muslim citizens of Lahore in the Barkat Ali Islamia Hall. The participants included Dr. Khalifa Shuja-ud-Din, Syed Mohsin Shah, Sardar Habibullah, Syed Maratab Ali Shah, Nawab Saadat Ali Khan,

Ghulam Mohy-ud-Din Qasuri, Haji Mir Shamas-ud-Din, Mian Feroz-ud-Din Ahmad, Majeed Malik (Editor, "Muslim Outlook"), Ghulam Rasul Mehr and Abdul Majid Salik (Editors, "Inqilab"), Syed Habib (Editor, "Siyasat"), Dr. Muhammad Sharif, Mian Haq Nawaz, Moulvi Fazl-ud-Din, Malik Muhammad Din, Fazal Karim, Abdullah, Mahbub Ilahi, Khan Bahadur Mir Aziz-ud-Din and Khan Sahib Khair-ud-Din. Dr. Muhammad Iqbal, who actually sponsored the idea, presided over the meeting and in his inaugural address outlined the aims and objects of the proposed conference. It was unanimously decided to invite to the conference all Muslim members of the legislatures, municipal committees and district boards of the four provinces, delegates from various Muslim organizations and other leading personalities of the region. All those present became the members of the Reception Committee. Mr. Majeed Malik was elected as Secretary and Nawab Saadat Ali Khan as Financial Secretary.

There arose two important questions:

1. Does it mean that Muslims of the Northern India have no sympathy with their co-religionists in the rest of India?
2. If the problems of the Muslims of Bengal are similar to those of the Muslims of North-West region, why should Bengal be excluded from the proposed parleys?

On behalf of Iqbal, "Inqilab" said that separate regional consultations were necessary because all opposition was directed at undermining Muslim rights in the Muslim majority provinces, while the weightage given to Muslims in the minority provinces had hardly ever been challenged by the Hindus, the Government of India or by the Simon Commission. Regarding the exclusion of Bengal, it was stated that it was only because of the long distance involved, however, it was pointed out that if the Muslims of Bengal would hold a similar conference, the Muslims of the North-West region would give them their full support.

On December 4, 1930, another meeting of the Reception Committee was held at the residence of Iqbal. At this meeting,

Syed Afzal Ali Hasni, another leading citizen joined the Committee. Maulana Syed Habib was asked to work as Co-Secretary along with Mr. Majeed Malik. The Conference was named "Upper India Muslim Conference" and a small staff was appointed. A few days later it was revealed that Haji Abdullah Haroon, the prominent Sind leader, had joined the sponsors and was mobilizing public opinion in Sind in support of the project.

This was all a prelude to Iqbal's historic presidential address at Allahabad. Within a few days the objects before the sponsors of the Upper India Muslim Conference became more clear, for on December 14, 1930, there appeared on the front page of "Inqilab" a double-column box carrying an appeal to Muslims to give their full co-operation in holding the conference. The first two lines in the poster-box said:

> Punjab, Sind, N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan are a Muslim country.
> Keep the banner of Islam aloft in them.

The box continued to appear at short intervals for a few months.

At the end of December 1930, Dr. Mohammad Iqbal went to Allahabad and in the course of his presidential address at the annual session of the All-India Muslim League said: ". . . . The formation of a consolidated North-West Muslim State appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims at least of North-West India."

The idea of the Upper India Muslim Conference continued to agitate the mind of Iqbal. Meetings of the Reception Committee continued to be held, mostly at his residence, till roundabout the end of March 1931. After that Iqbal's strategy was to go on working for the Muslim demands as presented in the resolution of the All Parties Muslim Conference of 1929, also known as "Jinnah's Fourteen Points". In 1932, he attended the second Round Table Conference in London but was soon disillusioned, because he was opposed to any compromise that endangered Muslim majorities in Punjab and Bengal or promised any inferior status for Sind, N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan. He was totally opposed to an All India Federation and his view was that the British

Parliament should hand over responsibility to the autonomous province directly. Even in his presidential address at the Lahore Session of the All India Muslim Conference held in 1932, he said: "In my address to the All-India Muslim League, I raised my voice against the idea of an All India Federation. Subsequent events have shown that it is working only as a drag on political advance of India." When the other Muslim delegates to the Round Table Conference agreed to the simultaneous introduction of provincial autonomy and central responsibility, Iqbal made a protest against that and characterised it as a grave political error. It is interesting to note that the federal part of the Government of India Act of 1935 was never introduced.

When in 1936, All-India Muslim League began to show signs of life under the leadership of the Quaid-i-Azam, Iqbal sent a number of letters to him explaining his viewpoint regarding the political future of the Muslims of the subcontinent. He was once more apprehensive of League following a line akin to the concept of a united India. So, on the one hand, he impressed upon the Quaid-i-Azam the desirability of carrying the two-nation theory to its logical conclusion and on the other, threw hints about another Upper India Muslim Conference. The following extract from his letter addressed to the Quaid-i-Azam dated June 21, 1937, will be read with interest:

"....It is obvious that the only way to a peaceful India is a redistribution of the country on the lines of racial, religious and linguistic affinities. Many British statesmen also realized this, and the Hindu-Muslim riots which are rapidly coming in the wake of this constitution are sure further to open their eyes to the real situation in the country. I remember Lord Lothian told me before I left England that my scheme was the only possible solution of the trouble of India, but that it would take 25 years to come. Some Muslims in the Punjab are already suggesting the holding of a North-West Indian Muslims Conference, and the idea is rapidly spreading. I agree with you, however, that our community is not sufficiently organized and disciplined and perhaps the time for holding such a conference is not yet ripe. But I feel

that it would be highly advisable for you to indicate in your address at least the line of action that the Muslims of North-West India would be finally driven to take. "To my mind the new constitution with its idea of a single Indian federation is completely hopeless. A separate federation of Muslim provinces, reformed on the lines I have suggested above, is the only course by which we can secure a peaceful India and save Muslims from the domination of non-Muslims. Why should not the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal be considered as nations entitled to self-determination just as other nations in India and outside India are?

"Personally I think that the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal ought at present to ignore Muslim minority provinces. This is the best course to adopt in the interest of both Muslim majority and minority provinces."

The Lucknow Session of the All-India Muslim League played a great role in the rejuvenation of the separatist movement but it also reaffirmed its faith in a united India. However, Iqbal continued to stick to his opinion and under his inspiration the Punjab Muslim Students' Federation decided to work for the establishment of a Muslim National State in the North-West of India. So was the case with the Inter-Collegiate Muslim Brotherhood of Lahore. The Punjab Muslim Students' Federation went a step further by accepting applications for affiliation from the Muslim Students' Federations established in Sind, N.W.F.P. and Kashmir. Having been the Founder-Secretary of this organization, I can safely say that this was done on the advice of Iqbal.

A careful study of the last para in the letter quoted above, seems to suggest that Iqbal visualised, at some future date, a bifurcation of the All-India Muslim League into two parts, one representing the Muslim-majority provinces and working for the establishment of Pakistan and the other representing Muslim-minority provinces and struggling for a rightful place in the body-politic of Hindu India as a strong minority. It is quite possible that such a course, if it had been adopted, might have spared the Indian Muslims the pangs they suffered at the time of Partition. However, this statement requires further thought on the part of historians.

IQBAL'S ALLAHABAD ADDRESS: AN ANALYSIS

WHAT was Iqbal's concept of a "North-Western Muslim National State" that he demanded in 1930 in the course of his address at the Allahabad session of the All India Muslim League? Did he visualise an independent and sovereign state or a state within an Indian Federation? If he sought a Muslim India within India, did it mean that he had faith in the indivisibility of the sub-continent? Lastly, did he or did he not make a demand for the establishment of a Muslim State in Bengal, and if not, why? These are some of the questions whose answer depends upon a careful analysis of the Allahabad address, a document of great significance, which like Rousseau's "Social Contract" is most widely quoted but rarely studied in full.

"I lead no party, I follow no leader", asserted Iqbal while expressing his views as a student of Islam, its law and polity, its culture, its history and its literature. It was his belief that Islam was the major formative factor in the life history of Indian Muslims and it furnished those basic emotions and loyalties which gradually unify scattered individuals and groups and finally transform them into a well-defined people, possessing a moral consciousness of their own. Discarding the European concept of religion as the private faith of an individual having nothing to do with man's temporal life, Iqbal said: "Islam does not bifurcate the unity of man into an irreconcilable duality of spirit and matter. In Islam, God and the Universe, spirit and matter, church and state are organic to each other. For such a group of people, the concept of an Indian nationhood and the construction of a polity on national lines amounted to a negation of the Islamic principle of solidarity and, therefore, not acceptable to Muslims. Iqbal had no hesitation in saying that "if the principle that the Indian Muslim is entitled

to full and free development on the lines of his own culture and tradition in his own Indian homelands is recognised as the basis of a permanent communal settlement, he will be ready to stake all for the freedom of India". He added: "The life of Islam in this country very largely depends on its centralization in a specific territory."

Iqbal further said: "The principle that each group is entitled to free development on its own lines is not inspired by any feeling of narrow communalism. There are communalisms and communalisms. A community which is inspired by feelings of ill-will towards other communities is low and ignoble. I entertain the highest respect for the customs, laws, religious and social institutions of other communities. Nay, it is my duty, according to the teaching of the Quran, even to defend their places of worship if need be. Yet I love the communal group which is the source of my life and behaviour; and which has formed what I am by giving me its religion, its thought, its culture and thereby recreating its whole past, as a living operative factor, in my present consciousness.

"The religious ideal of Islam is organically related to the social order which it has created. The rejection of the one will eventually involve the rejection of the other. Therefore, the construction of a polity on national lines if it means the displacement of the Islamic principle of solidarity, is simply unthinkable to a Muslim. This is a matter which at the present moment directly concerns the Muslims of India."

Taking a wider view of the problem, Iqbal said: "India is Asia in miniature. Part of her people have cultural affinities with nations in the East and part with nations in the middle and West of Asia. If an effective principle of co-operation is discovered in India, it will bring peace and mutual goodwill to this ancient land which has suffered so long, more because of her situation in historic space than because of any inherent incapacity of her people. And it will, at the same time, solve the entire political problems of Asia . . . . I demand the formation of a consolidated Muslim State in the best interests of India and Islam. For India it means security and peace resulting from the internal balance of power: for Islam an

opportunity to rid itself of the stamp that Arabian Imperialism was forced to give it, to mobilize its laws, its education, its culture, and to bring them into closer contact with its own original spirit and with the spirit of modern times."

For the implementation of this principle, Iqbal supported the Muslim demands formulated by the All Parties Muslim Conference held at Delhi. Those included—recognition of Muslim majority in Punjab and Bengal, carving out of a new Muslim province by separating Sind from Bombay, introduction of constitutional reforms in N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan, recognition of the principle of maximum provincial autonomy and a federal form of Government, 33 per cent Muslim representation in the Federal Legislature and the establishment of a convention that no legislation affecting a particular community would be effective unless confirmed by three-fourth majority of members of a legislature belonging to that community.

However, Iqbal visualised something more, a peaceful co-existence of the two ideologies, the Muslim Ideology and the Hindu Ideology, in healthy competition with each other within the framework of a Federal India. For that it was necessary to weld the various contiguous Muslim provinces into one state, so that instead of frittering away their energies in working in watertight compartments, they could make a unified effort. He, therefore, said: "Personally I would go further than the demands embodied in it (resolution of the All Parties Muslim Conference). I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. Self-government within the British Empire, or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims at least of North-West India."

The words 'at least' show that Iqbal had not forgotten Bengal and the fact that he had in the same address supported the recognition of the Muslim majority in Bengal adds further to the significance of the words 'at least'. Moreover, the use of the word

'state' for this region was necessary because a number of provinces were to be welded into one. When one part of India was to be called 'state', the corollary followed that all provinces including Bengal were to be named as such. Thus, there was hardly a necessity to specify the establishment of a Muslim state of Bengal; it was so obvious. This should, once for all, put an end, to the fallacy that Iqbal only thought of North-West India and not of the Muslims of Bengal.

Iqbal did not aim at the subjugation of non-Muslim minorities in the proposed states. It was in fact just the reverse of it. His effort was to exclude as many non-Muslims as possible in order to add to the homogeneity of a state.

He himself pointed out: "The exclusion of Ambala Division and perhaps of some districts where non-Muslims predominate, will make it less extensive and more Muslim in population—so that the exclusion suggested will enable this consolidated state to give a more effective protection to non-Muslim minorities within its area."

By implication he expresses the same view about Bengal, because in another part of his address he vigorously put forward the view that a territorial redistribution was necessary "so as to secure comparatively homogeneous communities possessing linguistic, racial, cultural and religious unity."

These states were to be completely autonomous even possessing "provincial armies necessary for maintaining internal peace". He said: "What is called 'residuary powers' must be left entirely to self-governing states, the Central Federal State exercising only those powers which are expressly vested in it by the free consent of federal states." The Federal Assembly was not to be a popular assembly. It was to consist of representatives of the states forming part of the Federation.

In the Hindu mind there lurked a constant suspicion, that Muslims of India if afforded an opportunity to have autonomous Muslim provinces along the North-West border, would ultimately seek inspiration from Muslim Lands across the border. Srinivasa

Sastri openly accused Muslims of being motivated by the desire 'to acquire means of exerting pressure in emergencies on the Government of India'. Iqbal did his best to allay the suspicion by holding out the assurance that "in the North-West India, Muslims would prove the best defenders of India against a foreign invasion, be that invasion one of ideas or of bayonets". He went a step further and offered the stationing on the North-West Frontier of "a strong Indian Frontier Army, composed of units recruited from all provinces and officered by efficient and experienced military men taken from all communities".

In another part of his address, he said: "I am perfectly sure that scheme of a neutral Indian Army, based on a federated India, will intensify Muslim patriotic feeling, and finally set at rest the suspicion, if any, of Indian Muslims joining Muslims from beyond the frontier in the event of an invasion."

Thus we find that Iqbal's concept of a North-West Indian Muslim state was that of a completely autonomous state at par with other Indian states, including the Muslim state of Bengal with such territorial adjustments as necessary, maintaining its own army and coming to an understanding with Hindu states with a view to establishing a system of peaceful co-existence of the two ideologies in healthy rivalry with each other and assuring the Hindus of security against foreign aggression through the means of neutral army of composite character.

However, he regarded the Indian problem as an international rather than a national one and he also had in his mind the possibility of the ultimate secession of the Muslim states. That is why he said: "I am not hopeless of an inter-communal understanding, but I cannot conceal from you the feeling that in the near future our community may be called upon to adopt an independent line of action to cope with the present crisis."

And he concluded: "I do not wish to mystify anybody when I say that things in India are not what they appear to be. The meaning of this, however, will dawn upon you only when you have achieved a real collective ego to look at them." And when the Muslim nation developed that collective ego, the result was Pakistan.

IMMEDIATE REACTION TO IQBAL'S ALLAHABAD ADDRESS

WHAT was the immediate reaction to Iqbal's Allahabad address in 1930 that envisaged the establishment of a North-Western Muslim National State? How was the proposal received by the British, the Muslims and the Hindus? Our professional historians are silent on this point. However, this is an essential link in the story of Pakistan which ought to be traced through a careful scrutiny of the contemporary records.

Iqbal's address came at a time when Muslim India was passing through a great crisis. 'To be or not to be' was the question before the Muslim nation. This was because Whitehall was the venue of a secret concordat arrived at between the traditionally pro-Hindu Labour Prime Minister, Ramsay MacDonald and the narrow-minded Hindu leadership thinking in terms of Hindu *Raj* under the aegis of the British. They agreed on a scheme of constitutional reforms providing for a strong centre with Hindu position being further strengthened by the inclusion of Princes in a Federation of India. With the Round Table Conference in session, Muslim leadership was completely isolated and demoralised. The Muslim delegates had come with a mandate to insist on maximum provincial autonomy, a weak centre, recognition of Muslim majority in the Punjab and Bengal, separation of Sind from Bombay Presidency, introduction of reforms in N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan and on Separate Electorate. Faced by the united Anglo-Hindu front, they were reeled back from their position and they began giving concession after concession. They disturbed Iqbal who found a God-sent opportunity to project his views when he was elected as the President of the Allahabad Session of the All India Muslim League. The result was the historic address he delivered, declaring that the destiny of Indian Muslims was the establishment of a

North-Western Muslim National State comprising Punjab, Sind, N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan.

That was a bomb-shell for the British as well as the Hindus. Mr. F. W. Wilson, the London Correspondent of the *Indian Daily Mail* of Bombay said in his despatch dated December 31, 1930 that Ramsay MacDonald was highly displeased with the views expressed by Iqbal. This was followed by a despatch from London published in the *Leader* of Allahabad in its issue, dated January 4, 1931. This stated that the British as well as Indian circles in the Round Table Conference expressed resentment against what it called an assault made by Iqbal on the idea of an all-India constitution being worked out there. Later the *Times of India* and the *Pioneer* wrote editorials against Iqbal's proposal.

The *Tribune* of Lahore attributed motives to Iqbal. In its issue dated January 1, 1931, it alleged that Iqbal was vindictive because he was not invited to the current session of the Round Table Conference. It was of the view that Iqbal had torpedoed all chances for a communal settlement, first by sending a telegram to Muslim delegates protesting against their conditional acceptance of the principle of joint electorate and then by delivering his Presidential address at Allahabad.

The Hindu press maligned Iqbal on a very large scale. Throughout the subcontinent, Hindu papers carried on a tearing and raging campaign against him and even attributing statements which he never made. "A dangerous Muslim of Northern India" was the title given to an article that appeared in *Pratap*, a leading Hindu daily, notorious for its vituperative outbursts against Muslims. It was full of abusive epithets like 'fanatic, mischievous, dangerously prejudiced, venomous, narrow-minded, and mean'. Another Hindu writer made the allegation that Iqbal wanted to deprive the Hindus of their homeland and hand over the same to the Muslims. Then followed an article by Bipin Chandra Pal, a well-known and seasoned Bengali journalist, which was reproduced by many Hindu papers. He accused Iqbal of dreaming the revival of Muslim rule in India.

There was only one intelligent analysis of the address made by a Hindu writer and he, too, did not disclose his name. Writing under the by-line of "A Liberal Hindu" in the *Times of India*, he said that Iqbal's argument carried considerable weight because with the inclusion of Indian states in the proposed federal structure the position of Hindus was bound to be further strengthened *vis-a-vis* Muslims. Under the circumstances, Iqbal's plea for the establishment of a North-Western Muslim State with an overwhelming Muslim majority required a sympathetic consideration, he added. The writer told his co-religionists that as Hindus constituted very small minorities in Sind, Baluchistan and N.W.F.P., they had no status in those provinces. In the event of a North-Western Muslim State, they would have a strong minority and if they collaborated with Sikhs, they would be a power to be reckoned with. Therefore, he advised Hindus not to be alarmed unnecessarily.

Now about the Muslim reaction. The delegates at the Allahabad session of the All India Muslim League listened to the address but neither discussed it nor expressed any opinion in favour or otherwise. This was probably because the issue was so important that it could not be discussed in the absence of leaders like the Aga Khan, M. A. Jinnah, Sir Mohammad Shafi and Mohammad Ali, who were all in England attending the Round Table Conference. Another reason could be the prejudice against Iqbal on the part of Muslim leaders in the Muslim-minority provinces, as a few months earlier he had declared his intention to call an Upper India Muslim Conference at Lahore representing Muslim leadership of Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan and N.W.F.P. on the plea that the Muslim leaders of Muslim-minority provinces failed to understand the problems of the Muslim-majority provinces.

The *Inqilab* of Lahore came to the rescue of Iqbal and wrote about a dozen editorials in January 1931 in defence of Iqbal's proposal. Its plea was that the proposal for the partition of India actually emanated from Hindu quarters. Lala Lajpat Rai was the first to suggest a migration of population on communal basis and he had clearly proposed that the Hindus of Northern India

should migrate to Central and South India and the Muslims of those regions should adopt Northern India as their homeland. Parmanand, another prominent Hindu leader, had made the same proposal. And only a few days before Iqbal delivered his address, Professor G. R. Abhyankar, an expert on the problems of Indian states, had envisaged a division of the subcontinent into two States, Muslim India and Hindu India. The *Inqilab* failed to understand why Iqbal was denied the right to suggest the same proposal.

Two days later, in its issue dated January 9, the *Inqilab* wrote: "If Hindus are justified in ignoring the Muslims and working for the establishment of Hindu *Raj* only on the basis of their brute majority, surely Muslims, too, were justified in declaring as their goal, the establishment of a Muslim National State comprising Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan and N.W.F.P., where they command about eighty per cent majority. Some people have suggested that the Hindu-Muslim issue be referred to the League of Nations for a solution. If they really believe in the principle of the right of self-determination as enunciated by the League of Nations at the time of its inception, let them seek an opinion from the League whether a region with eighty per cent Muslim majority deserved a Muslim government or not."

"Civil war was the only alternative to the solution proposed by Iqbal," was the opinion expressed by the same paper in its issue dated January 11. It stated: "If in accordance with the proposal made by Iqbal, the right to freedom of the Muslim majority in Northern India is recognised, there will be complete tranquillity throughout India. Hindus, as well as Muslims, will be enabled to live in their respective regions a life of peace and prosperity. However, if the Hindus, entering into a conspiracy with the ruling authority in England, are successful in establishing a political set up of their own liking, the Muslims will not allow it to exist even for a day. This will lead to a civil war without an end which would surely be not very pleasant for the Hindus."

The *Hamdam* of Lucknow in the course of an editorial dated January 5, expressed the opinion that Islam's survival as

a cultural force depended on the establishment of a Muslim National State in Northern India. It added: "This will cause a patriotic fervour among Muslims and they would be in an ideal position to defend India with all the might at their command against a possible attack from the Bolsheviks or the Afghans. This is the best solution of the Muslim problem. Let the Indian Muslims forge a united front for the attainment of this goal."

Slowly the Muslim public opinion veered round the proposal. Three student workers from Calcutta, namely, Mr. Raghib Ahsan, Fazal Rasul Khan Afridi and S. M. Salim, issued a joint statement in support of Iqbal's address and suggested the initiation of a "Muslim Ideal Fund" in order to finance a vigorous propaganda drive in support of Iqbal. From Allahabad, Mr. Abdur Rab, an advocate issued a statement and said: "You can show Muslims as people of different provinces only in books of geography, but it is a fact as Muslims, they are united in heart. They have the same religion, the same civilization and the same language."

However, the greatest impact of Iqbal's address was received in the territories now comprising Pakistan. The idea of an Upper India Muslim Conference was revived. In Lahore, the protagonists included Dr. Iqbal, Khan Saadat Ali Khan, Khwaja Feroz-ud-Din Ahmad, Maulana Ghulam Rasul Mehr and Maulana Abdul Majid Salik (Editors of *Inqilab*), Mr. Majeed Malik (editor of *Muslim Outlook*) and many others. In Sind, Haji Abdullah Haroon, the most influential Muslim leader of that region, was day and night busy in popularising the ideal placed by Iqbal before the Muslims.

In conclusion, I would like to give the last para of *Inqilab's* editorial entitled "Iqbal's Victorious March Against Hindu *Raj*" published in its issue dated January 17:

"The truth stands declared. The untruth lies prostrate. Hindu machinations have been exposed. Long live the personality that showed light to a *Millat* that was lost in the magic of deceptive slogans of nationalism and democracy. God willing, this light would remain a constant companion of the Muslims of India till they reach their destination."

RAHMAT ALI'S PAKISTAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT

AT the Round Table Conference held in London by the British Government, the Muslim representatives concurred with the non-Muslim representatives on the proposal to form an All-India Federation on the conditions that Sind be separated from Bombay, the N.W.F.P. be upgraded to the status of a Governor's province, introduction of Separate Electorates for Muslims and recognition of the statutory Muslim majorities in Punjab and Bengal. The Muslim representatives included the Aga Khan III, Nawab of Chhatari, Sir Abdur Rahim, Sahibzada Sir Abdul Qayyum, Sir Abdul Halim Ghaznavi, Sir Syed Ali Imam, Moulvi A. K. Fazl-ul-Haq, Sir Ghulam Husain Hidayatullah, Khan Bahadur Hafiz Hidayat Hasain, Sir Jamal Mohammad, Maulana Mohammad Ali, Sir Mohammad Shafi, Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, Sir Mohammad Iqbal, Maulvi Shafi Dawoodi, Syed Mohammad Padshah Sahib Bahadur, Nawab Sir Mehr Shah, Sir Shah Nawaz Bhutto, Sir Shafa'at Ahmad Khan, Begum Shah Nawaz, Sir Sher Muhammad, Sir Syed Sultan Ahmad, Maulana Shaukat Ali, Mr. S. S. Tyabji and Sir Mohammad Zafarullah Khan.

At this critical juncture emerged the personality of Ch. Rahmat Ali, who, having finished his education in England obtaining M.A. and LL.B. with honours from the Universities of Cambridge and Dublin, respectively, forsook the legal field and sponsored the Pakistan National Movement with its headquarters in Cambridge. He published a pamphlet entitled "Now or Never: Are we to live or perish for ever", to which the signatures of three other persons, namely, Mohammad Aslam Khan Khattak, Sahibzada Sheikh Mohammad Sadiq and Inayatullah Khan of Charsadda were also affixed.

To understand his thesis for the separate Federation of the Muslim-majority provinces of the north-west of India under the name of Pakistan, it is imperative to quote extensively as follows:

"At this solemn hour in the history of India, when British and Indian delegates are laying the foundations of a Federal Constitution for that subcontinent, we address this appeal to you, in the name of our common heritage, and on behalf of our thirty million Muslim brethren who live in Pakistan—by which we mean the five northern units of India, *viz.*, Punjab, North-West Frontier Province (Afghan Province), Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan. And we ask for your sympathy and support in our grim and fateful struggle against political crucifixion and national annihilation.

"India, constituted as it is, at the present moment, is not the name of a single country: nor the home of a single nation. It is in fact the designation of a state created by the British for the first time in history. It includes peoples who have never previously formed part of the Indian nation at any period of its history, but who have, on the contrary, from the dawn of history till the advent of the British, possessed and retained distinct nationalities of their own. One of such peoples is our own nation."

"In the five northern provinces of India, out of a total population of about forty millions, we, the Muslims, constitute about thirty million. Our religion and culture, our history and tradition, our social code and economic system, our laws of inheritance, succession and marriage are fundamentally different from those of most peoples living in the rest of India. The ideals which move our people to make the highest sacrifices are essentially different from those which inspire the Hindus to the same. These differences are not confined to broad basic principles. Far from it, they extend to the minutest details of our lives. We do not inter-dine; we do not inter-marry. Our national customs and calendars, even our diet and dress are different.

"In addressing this appeal to you and all other Muslims of India, we are addressing it also to the other two major parties—the British and the Hindu—involved in the settlement of India's

future. They must understand that, in this settlement, our body and soul are at stake. Our very being and well-being depend upon it. Not only ours, but also those of every other people in India. Therefore, to be acceptable to all, the settlement must be fair to all. They can make it so, if they will.

"This is especially true when, to the selfish settlement proposed by them, there is a just and reasonable alternative, which would lay the foundations of a peaceful future for the whole subcontinent; and which would allow the highest development of all, including each of the two peoples—the Hindu and the Muslim—without either being subject to the other. This alternative is a separate Muslim Federation of at least five predominantly Muslim units—Punjab, North-West Frontier Province (Afghan Province), Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan. This Muslim Federation of North-West India would provide the bulwark of a buffer state against invasion of India either of ideas or of arms from any quarter. And the creation of such a Federation would not materially disturb the ratio or the rights of the Muslim and Hindu population in the rest of India. It is, therefore, clearly in the interest of British and Hindu statesmanship to concede our demand for this Federation, and to have as an ally our free, powerful and contented Muslim nation, possessing a constitution similar to, but separate from, that which is being enacted for India. For, nothing but a separate Federation of our homelands will satisfy our people."

Ch. Rahmat Ali obviously seemed to have received inspiration from Iqbal's Allahabad Address as his proposal is more or less similar to that of Iqbal except that he included Kashmir in his plan and Iqbal did not because of the political expediency that had to be exercised by a leader of All-India importance. And if we compare Rahmat Ali's argument of Pakistan proving to be "the bulwark of a buffer state against invasion of India, either of ideas or of arms from any quarter" with Iqbal's argument that "possessing full opportunity of development within the body-politic of India, the North-West India Muslims will prove the best defenders of India against a foreign invasion, be that invasion one of ideas or bayonets," it becomes obvious that Rahmat Ali

had sought light from Iqbal's thesis. In the same pamphlet, Rahmat Ali says: "This demand is basically different from the suggestion put forward by Dr. Mohammad Iqbal in his presidential address to the All India Muslim League in 1930. While he proposed the amalgamation of four out of five above-named provinces into a single state forming a unit of the All India Federation, we propose that all these five provinces shall have separate Federation of their own outside India." This is a somewhat extraneous statement. A protagonist of Ch. Rahmat Ali, Khan A. Ahmad in his booklet "The Founder of Pakistan" harped on the same point and as a proof gave the following quotation from the Allahabad Address: "Personally I would go further than the demands embodied in it (the resolution of the All-Parties Muslim Conference, Delhi, 1928). I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state . . . ." (p. 27). It is interesting to note that he conveniently omitted to quote the following: "Self-government within the British Empire, or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims at least of North-West India." However, it is correct that Rahmat Ali's scheme was more clear-cut and free from all ambiguities while Iqbal's Allahabad address did conceive of a "Muslim India within India" or in other words a sort of confederative arrangement with the rest of Indian states. He came round to the point of a completely separate Federation of Muslim Provinces in 1937.

Ch. Rahmat Ali launched his Pakistan National Movement in 1933 but in his book named "Pakistan" published in 1947, claimed that he had actually made the proposal in 1915 when in his inaugural address to Bazm-i-Shibli in Lahore, he said: "North of India is Muslim and we will keep it Muslim. Not only that. We will make it a Muslim State. But this we could do only if and when we and our North cease to be Indian. For that is a prerequisite to it. So the sooner we shed Indianism, the better for us all and for Islam." (p. 214). This statement is to be taken with a pinch of salt because no documentary evidence of it is available from the contemporary

record of those days. Secondly, if it were correct, one fails to understand why Khan A. Ahmad did not mention it is his book in which he glorified Ch. Rahmat Ali beyond all proportions and at the expense of even Quaid-i-Azam. Thirdly, Ch. Rahmat Ali did not speak of it in any of his pamphlets and articles published from 1933 to 1946—not even in the course of his interview to Halide Edib, the Turkish journalist and author.

What was the attitude of the British towards Pakistan National Movement? On that Khan A. Ahmad's booklet provides us with important data in the form of extracts from the writings of some British politicians and publicists. "Mouse", the known authority on military affairs, in the course of an article published in the *Statesman* of Delhi dated August 3, 1933, pleaded for a "progressive policy" aiming at a gradual penetration of the tribal territories, lying between India and the Afghan border, and said that if that was not done "the sinister figure of Pakistan will rear its arrogant head". He further said: "It is idle and extremely foolish for anybody in India to shut his eyes to the Islamic movement which dreams of an Indian Muslim Confederation composed of the Punjab, the tribal territory (called Afghania), Kashmir and Sind. On . . . . a pretext of war against the Muslims of the border, an agitation, spreading through provinces and states, will arise which will make Civil Disobedience look like a *dhobi-ghat* scuffle. Pakistan will have tremendous backing; it already possesses great resources in fighting men; and it still dreams of the old Mughal glories in Hindustan. It will split Federation from top to bottom." (pp. 9-10).

The Duchess of Atholl, a member of the British Parliament, expressed grave apprehensions. In her book "The Main Facts of the Indian Problem" published in 1933, she said: "In view of the fact that such a Federation (of Muslim provinces) would include bulk of the fighting races of India, that it would control her most vulnerable frontier, and that beyond the frontier lies a continuous belt of Muslim states stretching to the Mediterranean, a greater political and military danger to India could hardly be

imagined. It might well mean civil war in India and an Afghan invasion with Soviet support." (p. 10).

In 1935, addressing the House of Commons on the Government of India Bill, Vyvyan Adams declared: "We need the fidelity of the Hindu community no less than we need the fidelity of the Muslims.... Such an arrangement (Pakistan in federative relation with Afghanistan) is not in accordance with our traditional ideas of Muslim loyalty, and would be quite inconsistent with what, during our history, we have grown to expect from the Muslim community." (p. 11).

Thus propaganda was conducted in two parallel directions. Hindus were told of the disastrous consequences of Pakistan and Muslims were told that the plan ran counter to their traditional loyalty to the British. The former theme was harped upon by Professor John Coatman, who, in the course of his book "Magna Britannia', published in 1934, characterised the Muslim trend towards a cohesion among Muslim states as "a powerfully disruptive factor in international relations and the world order of the future". He said: "One example of the international disorganization, which would be produced by any such development as this, would be provided by the amalgamation of Afghanistan and the Muslims of north-western India into one state. Such a project as this may be a chimera, but it is discussed seriously enough by some Muslims of standing in both the countries concerned. There are enthusiasts who foresee the rise of a great Muslim Kingdom, stretching from the Eastern borders of Persia to Calcutta, and including Kashmir and some of the khanates, or little kingdoms, of Turkistan and central Asia. It is easy enough to point out the tremendous dislocation which would ensue from the realization of such dreams as this and the permanent insecurity and "the certainty of ultimate disaster from the inclusion in such a new state of millions of Hindus, who would form the Hindustan irredenta". (pp. 11-12). Thus Coatman in his enthusiasm to frighten the Hindus and to alarm the die-hard colonialists magnified the modest Pakistan Scheme by unwarranted and uncalled for inclusion of Afghanistan, portions of Central Asia and the whole of northern

India down to Calcutta. No doubt, this is a flagrant example of distortion and exaggeration.

These 'divide and rule' tactics on the part of the British publicists succeeded to a considerable extent as some Hindu leaders did take the cue from that and began expressing apprehensions. Here again, Khan A. Ahmad has provided us with important data. He quotes Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, a liberal Hindu leader to the effect that "should the British concede the Muslim demand, the Hindus would regard it as an act of treachery against India". The Secretary of the N.W.F.P. Hindu Sabha thanked God that Congress failed to collect the necessary number of volunteers to fight the independence battle for "whether India would have got independence or not, they (Muslims) would have carved out of India their vision of Pakistan". Rai Sahib Mehr Chand Khanna, Chairman, Reception Committee of the Frontier, Punjab and Sind Hindu Conference in his speech, in August 1944, expressed grave fears regarding the Pakistan National Movement and said: "If steps were taken by the Muslims to turn the dream of Pan-Islamism into a reality, Hindus of the Frontier, the Punjab and Sind would be the first and the foremost to suffer." Professor Gulshan Rai, a well-known publicist and columnist of Punjab, came out with an article in the *Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore, dated August 19, 1934, in which he said: "Let the Foreign Office and Army Headquarters of the Government of Delhi or Simla express their opinion on this Pakistan Scheme. It is well-known that all the strategic positions for the defence of India lie in these five North-Western Provinces. Once an enemy crosses the Pabbi Hills near Lalamusa, he has no natural obstacles to face him right up to Calcutta . . . . If a Muslim federation for the five North-Western provinces is established as is demanded by some Muslims, the federal government for the rest of India would not be worth the paper on which its constitution may be drawn."

A year later, the same publicist sought government assistance in curbing what he called the Pakistan mentality. Here is an extract from his article in the *Tribune*, Lahore, October 12, 1935: "The present day mentality of the Muslims is formed by . . . . those who

want to constitute the entire Indus Valley and the lands watered by its tributaries into what they are pleased to call Pakistan, or the land where the holy Muslim law is to prevail. Unless the Government rigorously enforces the existing British Indian Law, there can be no communal peace in the country. The developments of this .... Pakistan mentality in the North-West are as dangerous to the Hindus and the Sikhs as they undoubtedly are to the Government." (p. 14).

This cliche of "Pakistan mentality" became a fetish with the Hindu press and the Hindu leaders of the Punjab and N.W.F.P. The author vividly remembers that in season and out of season, the cliche was applied consistently and continuously for every effort in the direction of improving Muslim position in different spheres of life, political and non-political, not having the remotest connection with the idea of Pakistan.

The funniest aspect of the situation was the fact that till the mid-thirties no Muslim leader of any significance had ever supported the Pakistan National Movement. The entire Muslim leadership, including Dr. Mohammad Iqbal, had agreed to work within the framework of an Indian Federation on the basis of Jinnah's Fourteen Points. The indifference shown to the movement is obvious from the following record as given in the Minutes of Evidence presented before the Joint Committee on Indian Constitutional Reforms (Session 1932-33), Vol. II c, p. 1496 (published by His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1934):

Question 9598, Sir Reginald Craddock: I will pass on. If any of the delegates or the witnesses would like to answer, will they tell me whether there is a scheme for Federation of Provinces under the name of Pakistan?

Answer 9598, Abdullah Yusuf Ali: As far as I know, it is only a students' scheme; no responsible people have put it forward.

Question 9599, Sir Reginald Craddock: They have not so far, but, as you say, you advance very quickly in India, and it may be, when these students grow up, it will be put forward; that scheme must be in the minds of the people anyhow.

Mr. Zafrullah Khan: What is the question?

Sir Reginald Craddock: I wanted to know whether the witnesses had acquaintance with a scheme which was drawn up for what is called Pakistan.

Mr. Zafrullah Khan: We have already had the reply that it was a students' scheme and there is nothing in it. What is the further question?

Mr. Isaac Foot: What is Pakistan?

Mr. Zafrullah Khan: So far as we have considered it, we have considered it chimerical and impracticable. It means the federation of certain provinces.

Sir Reginald Craddock: I have received communications about the proposal of forming certain Muslim states under the name of Pakistan.

Dr. Khalifa Shujauddin: Perhaps it will be enough to say that no such scheme has been considered by any representative gentleman or association so far.

The impact of Ch. Rahmat Ali's Movement in the territories now comprising Pakistan, was almost negligible till the mid-thirties. Ch. Rahmat Ali, while at Cambridge, used to scan through the pages of the Muslim dailies of the region and it was his habit to find out the names of prominent persons among the younger generation and send them a copy of his pamphlet "Now or Never". I received it in 1935 in my capacity as Secretary of the Servants of Islam League. I was just a first year student in Islamia College, Lahore. The contents of the pamphlet made substantial impact on me because it set me thinking in that direction and it really fascinated me. Therefore, I presume that many others who received the pamphlet had experienced a similar reaction. However, it is a fact that no organised effort was made by anyone of us in popularising the concept. Of course, there existed many persons who either under the influence of Iqbal's Allahabad Address or of Ch. Rahmat Ali's pamphleteering thought on the lines of "Pakistan", but they were passive, rather than active supporters. By mid-thirties, Pakistan was almost exclusively talked about by the Hindu press alone for whom it had become a bogey.

Ch. Rahmat Ali was more well-known abroad than in the subcontinent. Pakistan, as envisaged by him, was included as a subject in a number of encyclopaedias and Halide Edib, the famous Turkish writer, author and journalist, included in her book, "Inside India", a full chapter based on an interview with him, which helped a lot in projecting the idea even in the subcontinent, as an Urdu translation of the book appeared a couple of years later. It seems worthwhile to give here a summary of that interview.

Tracing the origin of the Pakistan National Movement, Ch. Rahmat Ali said: "The Muslims have lived there (in Pakistan) as a nation for over twelve hundred years, and possess a history, a civilization, and a culture of their own. The area is separated from India proper (Hindustan) by the Jumna; and it is not a part of India . . . . The Muslims in Hindustan (India proper) are in their national home. Therefore, Hindustan was the Muslim empire, where for over nine hundred years they ruled over a vast native majority. But when they lost this colonial Empire, as distinct from Pakistan, the Muslims who settled in these Muslim Imperial Dominions of Hindustan became a minority community in Hindustan . . . . It is a tragedy that this historical tragedy was callously ignored. The two—Pakistan and Hindustan—were confused. Hence the present catastrophe." (pp. 352-53).

The Muslim leaders who agreed to work within the framework of an Indian Federation were called "careerists". Ch. Rahmat Ali said: "It is this grave menace to the national existence which has led us to create the Pakistan National Movement, which is founded on a political scheme based on age-old reality hitherto ignored . . . . The movement holds that only this solution can ensure honourable existence to both nations—Muslims in Pakistan and Hindus in Hindustan—and, also, put an end to the exploitation of both by British Imperialism. We are not even Pan-Islamists. We are simply Pakistanis. . . . We know that within Hindustan we will be a minority community, but outside it, a virile nation of forty-two millions. . . . We, thirty-two million Muslims of Pakistan, constitute about one-tenth of the whole Muslim world. Again, out of a total number of fifty-four nations, who are members of the

League of Nations, no fewer than fifty-one are smaller than Pakistan—both in population and in area. Our area is four times that of Italy, three times that of Germany, and twice that of France; and our population seven times that of Australia, four times that of Canada, twice that of Spain, and equal to France and Italy, considered individually." (pp. 354-56).

Ch. Rahmat Ali's claim of having established propaganda centres all over Pakistan and of having branches in all provinces, was not correct—at least in 1936, when he gave the interview. He made a cogent reply to the question whether Pakistan could be economically self-sufficient, and when asked about the form of government he visualised, he said: "Our first aim is to achieve independence for Pakistan—both from British Imperialism and from Hindu capitalism. For the moment, this question eclipses all other questions. As to the form of Government, one thing is certain. It will be fundamentally democratic and socialistic. Whether it will be federal or unitary, can be left to be determined later by the free will of the nation, when we have secured the existence of the Fatherland." Answering a question on the effect of the Movement on the Muslim-Hindu problem, he said: "It is my unalterable conviction that only the firm establishment of an independent Pakistan, can finally solve the Muslim-Hindu problem.... Given honourable existence to both nations—Muslims in Pakistan and Hindus in Hindustan—the national pride of each will be satisfied, and the historic clash replaced by neighbourly goodwill and friendly cooperation." (pp. 357-59).

With regard to the future of Muslim minority in Hindustan, he said: "....the only effective guarantee we can offer is that of reciprocity, and, therefore, we solemnly undertake to give all these safeguards to non-Muslim minorities in Pakistan which will be conceded to our Muslim minority in Hindustan." (p. 360).

In the concluding paragraph of the chapter, Halide Edib said: "According to a considerable number of Muslims in or out of politics, whom the writer questioned in regard to the Pakistan National Movement, its adherents are mostly in Punjab or among Muslim students who live abroad." (p. 362). She had met Iqbal

but one does not know if he was amongst those who expressed a favourable reaction to the Pakistan National Movement.

Subsequently, Ch. Rahmat Ali presented a much more ambitious plan, but that will be discussed in a later chapter.

AN EYE-WITNESS ACCOUNT

THE year 1937 was a very significant year in the political history of the subcontinent. The Government of India Act of 1935 began to operate in so far as Provincial Autonomy was concerned. General elections were held to all provincial legislatures. The Congress secured majority of seats in all Hindu-majority provinces as well as in the N.W.F.P. but its performance was very poor in Muslim constituencies. Of a total of 482 Muslim seats, it contested only 58 and won only 26 and these too mainly in the N.W.F.P. where Khudai Khidmatgars or Red Shirts were its allies. Therefore, it lost all claim to represent more than five per cent of Muslim voters. Muslim League, too, also did not fair well, for it could win only 102 seats because bulk of Muslim seats were secured by provincial political parties. However, when the All India Muslim League held its annual session at Lucknow in October 1937, the Muslim Chief Ministers in the Punjab, Bengal and Assam joined the organization along with their Muslim followers. It was a momentous session, for the League became a more or less fully representative body. It was rejuvenated and placed in a position to become a mass organization in the real sense of the term, under the dynamic leadership of Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah.

The significance of that year was also due to the fact that while the League's objective was to work within the framework of an Indian Federation after obtaining some guarantee, the Muslim students though fully supporting the League in its battle against the Congress, raised the banner of establishing a separate Muslim state in the North-West of India. Not only that, some other groups belonging to the younger generation worked publicly for the same ideal. Here is an eye-witness account of the new developments, for the author was one of the active participants as Founder-Secretary of the Punjab Muslim Students' Federation.

In August 1937, we parted ways with the Punjab Students Union which was a pro-Congress body. I, along with a number of other students of Lahore colleges, issued a joint statement to the press, suggesting the establishment of the Punjab Muslim Students Federation. The response was simply tremendous, and after a 20-day press campaign, we were in a position to set up the body with Mr. Hameed Nizami as President and myself as General Secretary. The other members of the provincial Executive included Mr. Justice Zaki-ud-Din Pal, Mian Mohammad Shafi (*Meem Sheen*), Maulana Abdus Sattar Khan Niazi, Amir Abdullah of Rokri and Mr. Justice Anwar-ul-Haq. We received blessings from the Quaid-i-Azam, Dr. Mohammad Iqbal, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, Malik Barkat Ali, Mr. K. L. Gauba, Nawab Shahnawaz Khan of Mamdote, and many other leaders.

Some of us met Dr. Mohammad Iqbal a number of times and discussed with him the political and organizational matters. While framing the constitution, we were on the horns of a dilemma—whether to toe the line of the Muslim League or to chalk out an independent course. When consulted on the point, Iqbal advised us to set a goal before us in regard to the Muslim destiny in the subcontinent. We sought his guidance but he was rather reluctant as that, according to him, would amount to dictation. He asked us to think for ourselves independently. On our insistence, he came out with the proposal that we set as our goal the establishment of a Muslim National State based on the Muslims' right of self-determination and comprising the Punjab, N.W.F.P., Sind and Baluchistan and Kashmir. We readily agreed—rather welcomed it, and within a couple of days called a meeting of the Executive, secured its approval and incorporated it in the constitution of the Punjab Muslim Students' Federation. As Iqbal did not use the word "Pakistan", we too did not use it. However, it goes without saying that none of us had read the Allahabad Address and it was the Pakistan National Movement of Ch. Rahmat Ali that had primarily influenced our minds.

There was a certain amount of hesitation on our part to advocate the goal publicly, because the Muslim League leaders

of the province other than Iqbal, would not talk of the subject because they stood for a united India. However, very soon Providence granted us the opportunity to shake off our hesitation and enter the arena with a bang. In the first week of October while we held a public meeting in the Habibia Hall of Islamia College, Lahore, where, despite opposition by Nawabzada Mahmud Ali (brother of Mr. Mazhar Ali Khan, Editor, *Viewpoint*, Lahore) the Muslim students gave their verdict in support of the Punjab Muslim Students' Federation. The Punjab Students Union announced a public meeting in Lajpat Rai Hall for condemning the "reactionary attempt at causing dissensions in the student community". The big guns of the Congress were to address the meeting. We mustered strong in the meeting in order to give a bit of our mind to the opponents. There was a very tense situation, with the Hall packed to capacity, by both Hindu and Muslim students. What happened to the other big guns of the Congress is a separate story but the drama enacted by Dr. Saif-ud-Din Kitchlu, an eminent nationalist leader and a great orator, is worth describing because that is very relevant to our subject. Dr. Kitchlu, in his typical style, first spoke in a low tone for a few minutes, then slowly raising the tempo, reached the pitch of his voice and cried: "Do you know what is in my hand?" and he waved the Constitution of our Federation. "This is the constitution of the Punjab Muslim Students' Federation and if I reveal its contents you will come to know that the students, who have come to the meeting to disturb it, are the agents of British Imperialism." Everybody was stunned. We too, were taken aback, not knowing how we innocent boys happened to be the agents of British Imperialism. There was pin-drop silence in the Hall. After that Dr. Kitchlu read out the section of the constitution in regard to the goal we had set before us and said: "They want partition of India in the same manner as Peel Commission has recommended partition of Palestine. Tell me, do you want partition?" Almost half of the Hall occupied by us spontaneously resounded with the slogan: We want Partition; we want Partition, while the others, the non-Muslims, raised slogans of "No; No" and "Shame; Shame". Thereupon, the meeting ended

in disorder and complete pandemonium prevailed. Both the groups came out of the Hall and gathered in opposition to each other. Seeing a clash imminent, the elderly Congress leaders, Dr. Gopi Chand Bhargawa, Dewan Chaman Lal and others intervened and in a few minutes the groups dispersed. The press gave the event a wide coverage and next evening when Hameed Nizami and myself met Iqbal, he looked jubilant at our performance and spoke a few words of encouragement. After that event, we felt no hesitation in advocating the idea of Pakistan.

The Quaid-i-Azam had read our constitution. He knew our goal, which was fundamentally different from that of the League. But he had faith in us that *vis-a-vis* Congress, we were ardent votaries of the Muslim League; therefore, he continued giving us his support. By the way, as I was in correspondence with the Quaid-i-Azam, in one of the letters I wrote on August 29, 1938, besides other things, I asked: "I would like to know your views about the Pakistan Movement which is getting a great prominence in the Punjab press. The scheme seems quite plausible." His reply was as follows: ". . . . I am sure you cannot expect me to discuss these matters in correspondence. I think the Muslims of India have yet to learn the political language and also they must learn to exercise a certain amount of patience. I hope of some success now that the Mussulmans are awakening to some self-respect and self-reliance, although they must take time to organize fully." (September 19, 1938). That gives a strong indication to the effect that he did not like to present the demand for Pakistan in a premature fashion.

For a number of years, there existed in Lahore, an association named the Inter-Collegiate Muslim Brotherhood. Originally, a student body with a limited membership, it grew into a non-student body, with a non-political complexion and devoted mainly to the publication of pamphlets on various aspects of Islam. In 1937, its Secretary, Mian Muhammad Shafi (Meem Sheen) (the well-known columnist) issued a statement in support of the establishment of a Muslim State. He also, in the course of a column which he used to contribute to the local weekly *New Times* suggested

that the Punjab Assembly should pass a resolution calling for the establishment of a separate federation of the Muslim-majority provinces in the North-West of India.

The same year, a new association was established in Lahore, under the name *Majlis-i-Kabeer-i-Pakistan* (Central Pakistan Committee) and it set up branches in a number of Punjab cities. The association owed allegiance to Ch. Rahmat Ali's Pakistan National Movement. Its workers included a number of zealous young men. They were persons of limited means, but in spite of that they succeeded in creating public opinion in support of Pakistan. Khurshid Alam, under the pen-name *Jahan Gard* wrote a number of research papers and more than one hundred articles throwing light on various aspects of Pakistan. These articles mainly appeared in the daily *Inqilab* of Lahore, whose editor, Maulana Abdul Majid Salik, had been supporting the idea of a separate Muslim state for a couple of years before the Allahabad Address was delivered. The *Majlis-i-Kabeer-i-Pakistan* held group discussions but never arranged public meetings. Their publicity campaign was, however, very strong. It continued throughout the late thirties and paved the way, partly of course, for the passage of the Lahore Resolution.

IQBAL'S LETTERS TO QUAID-I-AZAM

WHILE the Muslim young men in the Punjab openly worked for Pakistan, Iqbal was struggling hard behind the scenes to convert the Quaid-i-Azam to the idea of Pakistan. His confidential letters to the Quaid-i-Azam bear ample testimony to that. His object seemed to be the adoption by the Muslim League at its Lucknow session of the ideal of establishing two separate Muslim States, one in the North-West and the other in Bengal. Probably, he hoped of success because at one stage he advised us, the workers of the Punjab Muslim Students' Federation, to hold in abeyance the setting up of our goal till after the session was held. Though his hope did not materialise, it is a fact that the Quaid-i-Azam did receive impact of his letters. That is evident from the following concluding remarks in his Foreword to the collection of letters published in 1943: "His views were substantially in consonance with my own and had finally led me to the same conclusion as a result of careful examination and study of the constitutional problems facing India, and found expression in due course in the united will of Muslim India as adumbrated in the Lahore Resolution, popularly known as the Pakistan Resolution, passed on 23 March, 1940." (pp. 4-5).

A careful analysis of the letters shows that Iqbal was the first to realise that the Muslim League could not succeed in its mission unless it became a mass organization, bringing in its fold the common man. Secondly, it was possible only if the League tackled the problem of Muslim poverty. Thirdly, the problem could be solved by the introduction of social democracy in consonance with the spirit of Islam. Fourthly, such a development was possible only if the Mussulmans could secure the right of self-determination in the areas where they were in majority. Fifthly, Iqbal went a step

further from the Allahabad Address by advocating not one but two independent Muslim States, one in the North-West of India and the other, in Bengal. For a full understanding of Iqbal's views, it becomes imperative to quote in extento from the letters. The most comprehensive and all-embracing letter was the one he sent on May 28, 1937. It says:

"The League will have to finally decide whether it will remain a body representing the upper classes of Indian Muslims or Muslim masses who have so far, with good reason, taken no interest in it. Personally I believe that a political organization which gives no promise of improving the lot of average Muslim cannot attract our masses.

"Under the new constitution, the higher posts go to the sons of upper classes; the smaller ones go to the friends or relatives of the ministers. In other matters too, our political institutions have never thought of improving the lot of Muslims generally. The problem of bread is becoming more and more acute. The Muslim has begun to feel that he has been going down and down during the last 200 years. Ordinarily, he believes that his poverty is due to Hindu money-lending or capitalism. The perception that it is equally due to foreign rule has not yet fully come to him. But it is bound to come. The atheistic socialism of Jawahar Lal is not likely to receive much response from the Muslims. The question, therefore, is: how is it possible to solve the problem of Muslim poverty? And the whole future of the League depends on the League's activity to solve this question. If the League can give no such promises, I am sure the Muslim masses will remain indifferent to it as before. Happily, there is a solution in the enforcement of the law of Islam and its further development in the light of modern ideas. After a long and careful study of Islamic law, I have come to the conclusion that if this system of law is properly understood and applied, at least the right to subsistence is secured to everybody. But the enforcement and development of the Shariah of Islam is impossible in this country without a free Muslim state or states. This has been my honest conviction for many years and I still believe this to be the only way to solve the problems of bread for Muslims

as well as to secure a peaceful India. If such a thing is impossible in India, the only other alternative is a civil war which, as a matter of fact, has been going on for some time in the shape of Hindu-Muslim riots. I fear that in certain parts of the country, *e.g.*, North-Western India, Palestine may be repeated. Also the insertion of Jawahar Lal's socialism into the body-politic of Hinduism is likely to cause much bloodshed among the Hindus themselves. The issue between social democracy and Brahmanism is not dissimilar to the one between Brahmanism and Buddhism. Whether the fate of socialism will be the same as the fate of Buddhism in India, I cannot say. But it is clear to my mind that if Hinduism accepts social democracy, it must necessarily cease to be Hinduism. For Islam the acceptance of social democracy in some suitable form and consistent with the legal principles of Islam is not a revolution but a return to the original purity of Islam. The modern problems, therefore, are far more easy to solve for the Muslims than for the Hindus. But as I have said above, in order to make it possible for Muslim India to solve these problems, it is necessary to re-distribute the country and to establish one or more Muslim states with absolute majorities. Don't you think that the time for such a demand has already arrived? Perhaps this is the best reply you can give to the atheistic socialism of Jawahar Lal Nehru." (pp. 15—18).

In the concluding paragraph, Iqbal expressed the hope that the proposal would receive serious consideration in his presidential address or in the deliberations of the Lucknow session. In the post-script to the same letter, Iqbal said that he intended to deal with the subject in an open letter in the press, but on further consideration he felt that the time was not suitable for such a step.

On June 21, 1937, Iqbal wrote another long "private and confidential" letter to the Quaid-i-Azam. He started with a discussion of continuing Hindu-Muslim riots in the Muslim-majority provinces, characterised the same as "a state of civil war which, but for the police and military, would become universal in no time". He opined that while in the Hindu-majority provinces Muslims could be ignored altogether, even in Muslim-majority

provinces justice could not be done to Muslims because the ministries depended upon cooperation of Hindus. That brought him to the conclusion that there was something inherently wrong with the constitution. Then he said: "The Congress President has denied the political existence of Muslims in no unmistakable terms. The other Hindu political body, *i.e.*, the Mahasabha, whom I regard as the real representative of the masses of the Hindus, has declared more than once that a united Hindu-Muslim nation is impossible in India. In these circumstances, it is obvious that the only way to a peaceful India is a re-distribution of the country on the lines of racial, religious and linguistic affinities. Many British statesmen also realise this, and the Hindu-Muslim riots which are rapidly coming in the wake of this constitution are sure further to open their eyes to the real situation in the country. I remember, Lord Lothian told me before I left England that my scheme was the only possible solution of the troubles of India, but that it would take 25 years to come. Some Muslims in the Punjab are already suggesting the holding of a North-West Indian Muslim Conference and the idea is rapidly spreading. I agree with you, however, that our community is not sufficiently organized and disciplined and perhaps the time for holding such a conference is not yet ripe. But I feel that it would be highly advisable for you to indicate in your address at least the line of action that the Muslims of North-West India would be finally driven to take." (pp. 19—22).

It may here be recalled that the idea of holding a conference of the Muslims of the North-West of India was not a new one. As early as in the middle of 1930, Iqbal attempted to convene such a conference in Lahore under the name Upper India Muslim Conference, because it was his considered opinion that the problems faced by the Muslim-majority provinces of the North-West of India, were different from those faced by the Muslim-minority provinces. The letter also indicates that Quaid-i-Azam also approved of the idea but did not consider the time ripe for that. From that one could easily conclude that Quaid-i-Azam was actually convinced of the desirability of establishing Muslim state or states but was only waiting for an opportune moment to declare so.

In the same letter Iqbal said: "To my mind the new constitution with its idea of a single Indian Federation is completely hopeless. A separate federation of Muslim provinces reformed on the lines I have suggested above, is the only course by which we can secure a peaceful India and save Muslims from the domination of non-Muslims. Why should not the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal be considered as nations entitled to self-determination just as other nations in India and outside India are? Personally I think that the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal ought to ignore at present the Muslim minority provinces. This is the best course to adopt in the interests of both Muslim majority and minority provinces." (p. 22)

If we make a comparison of Iqbal's thesis in these letters with that presented in the Allahabad Address, we can easily reach the following conclusions:

1. In 1930, Iqbal stood for a "Muslim India within India" with possibly a confederal arrangement with Hindu India because he visualised composite armies to ensure the defence of the North-Western and North-Eastern borders. In 1937, he stood for completely independent and sovereign Muslim states.
2. In 1930, apparently one Muslim state was demanded that was to comprise the Muslim-majority provinces of the North-West of India. In 1937, he visualised two independent and sovereign Muslim states—one in the North-West and the other in Bengal.
3. In 1930, he treated Muslims of the Subcontinent as one nation. In 1937, he used the word nations (in plural) for the Muslims inhabiting the North-West India and Bengal entitled to the right of self-determination like other nations of the world.
4. In 1930, his entire emphasis was on the preservation of Muslim culture and the separate entity of the Mussulmans and the implementation of the Islamic Ideology. In 1937, the economic factor was played up and due emphasis

was placed on the introduction of social democracy in consonance with the spirit of Islamic Law.

5. In 1930, as he stood for "Muslim India within India", he considered the All India Muslim League as a suitable body for the attainment of his objective, but in 1937, he was of the view that Muslim-minority provinces might be ignored by the Muslims of the North-West of India and Bengal.

In regard to the impact of these letters on the Quaid-i-Azam, we have already quoted the last few lines of his Foreword to the booklet "Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah" and have also drawn some inferences from the text of one letter. However, a much better view could be taken if the replies of the Quaid-i-Azam had been available. In that connection, Quaid-i-Azam said in the Foreword as follows: "It is, however, much to be regretted that my own replies to Iqbal are not available. During the period under reference, I worked alone unassisted by the benefit of a personal staff and so did not retain the duplicate copies of the numerous letters that I had to dispose of. I made inquiries from the Trust of Iqbal's estate at Lahore and was informed that my letters are not traceable. Hence I had no alternative but to publish the letters without my replies. . . ." (p. 4).

MUSLIM LEAGUE ON ROAD TO PAKISTAN

THE Quaid-i-Azam did not consider it feasible to give a pointer in the direction of the possibility of establishing a separate Muslim state or states in his address to the Lucknow Session of the All India Muslim League in 1937. In fact, he said: "The Muslim League stands for full national democratic self-government for India." And when the League changed its goal to "full independence", it was in the context of one Federation of fully autonomous states. But things changed rapidly. The Congress rule in Hindu-majority provinces, by excluding really representative Muslims from the provincial cabinets and by installing their puppets as Muslim ministers had amply demonstrated its evil intentions. By foisting *Bande Matram* as the national anthem, enforcing Vidya Mandir educational scheme and declaring Hindi as the lingua franca, and by purging the administration of Muslim officers in key positions and by doing grave injustices to the Muslim minorities, the Congress proved itself to be a Hindu organization aiming at only Hindu welfare. That added fuel to the fire and the tempo of Congress-League tension rose to a high pitch. As a result, some Muslim League circles began to think on the lines of establishing a separate federation of Muslim provinces.

In October 1938, the Quaid-i-Azam, in the course of his presidential address to the Sind Provincial Muslim League Conference made the first pointer in the direction of Pakistan. He said: "I would draw the attention of the British statesmen and also of the Congress High Command and ask them to mark, learn and inwardly digest the recent upheaval and its consequent developments which threatened the world war. It was because the Sudeten Germans who were forced under the heel of the majority of Czechoslovakia who oppressed them, suppressed them, maltreated them

and showed a brutal and callous disregard for their rights and interests for decades; hence the inevitable result that the Republic of Czechoslovakia is now broken up and a new map will have to be drawn. Just as the Sudeten Germans were not defenceless and survived the oppression and persecution for two decades so also the Mussulmans are not defenceless and cannot give up their national entity and aspirations in this great continent." (Quoted by Pirzada, pp. 148-49).

However, the main important thing was the adoption, under the presidentship of the Quaid-i-Azam of the following resolution: "This Sind Provincial Muslim League Conference consider it absolutely essential in the interests of an abiding peace of the vast Indian continent and in the interests of unhampered cultural development, the economic and social betterment and political self-determination of the two nations, known as Hindus and Muslims, that India may be divided into two Federations, *viz.*, Federation of Muslim states and the Federation of non-Muslim states. This conference, therefore, recommends to the All India Muslim League to devise a scheme of constitution under which Muslim-majority provinces, Muslim Native states and areas inhabited by a majority of Muslims, may attain full independence in the form of a Federation of their own with permission to any other Muslim state beyond the Indian Frontiers to join the Federation, and with such safeguards for non-Muslim minorities as may be conceded to the Muslim minorities in the non-Muslim Federation of India." (Quoted by Pirzada from *Indian Annual Register*, (1938, Vol. II, pp. 45—47).

The moving spirit behind that resolution was the veteran Sind leader Haji Abdullah Haroon who was wedded to the idea since long, as when Iqbal convened an Upper India Muslim Conference in mid-1930, Abdullah Haroon was the first to respond from Sind.

In fact, as Chairman of the Reception Committee, Abdullah Haroon, in the course of his address, had suggested the lines of the coming resolution in the following words: ". . . . the very culture, religion and the existence of the Muslim community were in

jeopardy and they had despaired of getting any justice at the hands of the majority community. We have nearly arrived at the parting of ways and until and unless the problem is solved to the satisfaction of all, it will be impossible for anybody to save India from being divided into Hindu India and Muslim India, both placed under separate Federations." (Pirzada, p. 151).

The resolution was passed. The recommendation was made to the All India Muslim League but the big question was: how the Muslim public opinion be moulded in support of the idea and how the League be prevailed upon to implement the recommendation. How the mind of Abdullah Haroon worked in those days could be gauged from a very interesting article of reminiscences by Pir Ali Mohammad Rashidi, published in his weekly paper, "Muslim Voice" of Karachi in its issue dated April 30, 1945. That was reproduced in the biography of Haroon. By the way, Pir Ali Mohammad Rashidi was in later thirties closely associated with Abdullah Haroon. Haroon was the Chairman of the Foreign Sub-Committee of the All India Muslim League and Rashidi was the Secretary.

Abdullah Haroon once called him early in the morning and discussed the matter in detail. He said: "Here is a bundle of Punjab Hindu papers. While criticising our Karachi resolution, they have given great stimulus to the ideas underlying it. They have begun talking of Pakistan and this must catch the notice of the Muslims, and set them thinking. The more they (Hindu papers) oppose it, the more they would popularise it among the Muslims. We have no press of our own to propagate our ideas through. Thank God, the Hindus themselves have begun doing the job for us . . . but this is not enough. It connotes but one single milestone in the very long march which is ahead of us. We have to achieve what the Hindus may well call Pakistan. It is a very difficult task but not an impossible one. I am convinced that this is the only solution of the problem. But we must prepare the ground for it. (p. 135).

"Our goal being Pakistan (in one form or the other), that is, independent states for Mussalmans under a separate federation

of their own, we have now to find out an organization through which we might work for it. Our first choice must fall on the Muslim League and give it our utmost trial. Happily, Mr. Jinnah has now no other alternative left; Hindus themselves would force on him that course. But before that stage is reached, a good deal of spade work. . . ." (p. 136).

The same evening Rashidi met Haroon again and discussed the matter further. Rashidi says: "It was decided that I should undertake an explanatory tour of the two northern provinces of the Punjab and Frontier for these purposes:

To see what had been the reactions of our Karachi resolution and of the Hindu press comments on the Muslims.

To select suitable persons from among the Muslims who would support our scheme.

To study the general conditions obtaining in the two important Muslim majority provinces, whether they could be induced to work for this ideal.

To contact Allama Mashriqi of the *Khaksars* and see whether his support could be secured in this connection.

To see which other Muslim organizations in the provinces are most likely to be prevailed upon to support us.

To approach the Muslim Urdu press in the Punjab to take up this course.

To secure the services of some capable men to prepare literature on the subject.

To sound leaders of Muslim opinion in these provinces particularly Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan.

A date was fixed for my departure from Karachi and Mr. Valji (Haji Abdullah's accountant) did the rest for me." (p. 137).

Meanwhile Haji Abdullah Haroon wrote a letter to the Aga Khan on November 7, 1938 inviting him to visit India and "give us a lead here". Enclosing the Karachi Resolution and other relevant documents, he said in the last paragraph of his letter: "We are seriously considering the possibility of having a separate

Federation of Muslim States and provinces, so that we are free, once and for all, from the Hindu molestation. I shall be grateful if Your Highness will favour me with your opinion on the subject." The Aga Khan being too busy jotted down the following very brief reply: "Many thanks for your letter of 7 November. Will League agree to the last paragraph of your letter?" In December 1938, the Aga Khan visited India and in the course of a letter said (December 20, 1938): "About Hindu-Muslim relations, we would all welcome a possible solution. Is your League likely to advocate Pakistan as the final policy of Muslims? If so, the sooner public opinion is prepared gradually, the better." The reply from Haji Abdullah Haroon on December 28, 1938 was as follows: "The League, I feel, has no other alternative but to secure a separate Federation and the trend of thought in the League circles has lately been drifting in that direction. I enclose herewith copies of the resolutions passed at the Karachi Muslim League Conference and at the Delhi meeting of the All India Muslim League Council respectively, which do reveal an element of predilection towards that end, though the language of the Karachi [he means Delhi—(author)] resolution is slightly circumlocutory. (pp. 138—40.)

Haji Abdullah Haroon was in constant liaison with the Quaid-i-Azam and in early 1939, he revealed in a public statement that the Quaid was thinking on the same lines. The relevant extract from his statement is as follows: "He (Quaid-i-Azam) wants the Muslims to unite and merge themselves, heart and soul, into a huge struggle for maintaining the national integrity, solidarity and individuality of the Muslims. He is contemplating to put forth some alternative scheme of reforms, which may provide independent homelands for the Mussalmans in different parts of India where they may be able to pursue their own policy of progress without molestation from the Hindu-ridden centre. I do not, of course, want to discuss here the details of such schemes, for the draft schemes could be had from me on a mere requisition. What I mean to emphasise here is that the greatest advantage that will accrue from such a scheme will be that Mussulmans of India will be free from the potential danger of becoming victims of Hindu

interference and molestation in their day to day affairs of life. According to the proposal "the Muslims within their own zones will have the same opportunities of progress, growth and expansion as the Hindus in their respective regions". (pp. 147-48).

Thus we find that, while Iqbal attempted to convince the Quaid-i-Azam privately and confidentially of the desirability of establishing a separate Muslim state or states, and while the Punjab Muslim Students Federation not only adopted Pakistan as its goal but also worked openly for the same, and while the *Majlis-i-Kabeer-i-Pakistan* under the leadership of Rahmat Ali conducted a press campaign in the Punjab, Haji Abdullah Haroon by sponsoring and piloting through the Sind Muslim League Conference a resolution clearly demanding Pakistan, set the ball rolling in the direction of prevailing upon the All India Muslim League to adopt the new line for the emancipation of the Muslim nation in the Subcontinent both from the hegemony of British imperialism and Hindu domination.

FEDERATION OR CONFEDERATION ?

WHILE the common man was enamoured of the idea of establishing an independent and sovereign Muslim state or states, a number of intellectuals and politicians came forward with schemes for a Muslim India within India with a lot of safeguards for the preservation of Muslim nationhood but with loose federal or confederal bonds with India. The erstwhile exponents of completely independent and sovereign Muslim state or states also associated them with some of the schemes, maybe in order to make them a stepping stone to Pakistan. No doubt, the schemes of 1939 constituted an advance upon the concept of a bi-national Indian Federation to which Muslim League remained wedded for pretty long on the basis of the then obsolete Fourteen Points of Mohammad Ali Jinnah. These schemes envisaged greater security to Muslims and more checks and balances ensuring a better future of Muslim position in the constitutional set-up of the Subcontinent. In the historical process, through which the idea of Pakistan passed, these schemes do have a place. It, therefore, seems necessary to discuss them.

In the Punjab two schemes emerged almost simultaneously, one known as the confederacy of India by "A Punjabi" and the other Regional Scheme sponsored by Sardar Sikandar Hayat Khan, the Chief Minister of the Punjab. The former had the full support of Nawab Sir Shahnawaz Khan of Mamdote, President of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League whose name appeared on the book named "Confederacy of India" as publisher; and because of that it was popularly known as the Mamdote Plan. The real author "A Punjabi" was Mian Kifayat Ali, a retired Major of the Indian army who had a special liking for Dr. Mohammad Iqbal and Mian Fazle Hussain and claimed to have received inspiration

from them. The scheme also drew support from Haji Abdullah Haroon as well as of some young League workers. Sir Sikandar's scheme met with strong opposition from Muslim Leaguers and others. In fact, it was torpedoed by the daily *Inqilab* of Lahore which published about a dozen editorials criticising every aspect of it; although *Inqilab* was very friendly towards Sir Sikandar and his politics.

To understand these schemes, one has to keep in view the fact that the Indian subcontinent was composed of two major elements—the British India consisting of eleven provinces and the States' India comprising hundreds of internally autonomous native states ruled by Rajas and Nawabs with Britain as the paramount power. These states were interspersed throughout the Subcontinent. Whatever schemes were formulated, they covered both the provinces of the British India and the states situated within or contiguous to them.

Mamdote Plan

The Confederacy of India, popularly known as the Mamdote Plan, envisaged the establishment of the following five federations:

1. Indus Region's Federation: Punjab (excluding Ambala Division and some other Hindu-majority areas); Sind; N.W.F.P.; Kashmir; Baluchistan, Bahawalpur; Amb, Dir, Swat and Chitral, Khairpur; Kalat; Las Bela; Kapurthala; Malerkotla.
2. Hindu India Federation: United Provinces (with the possible inclusion of Delhi and Hindu-majority areas of the Punjab); Central Provinces; Bihar with some portions of Bengal; Orissa; Assam excluding the districts of Goalpara and Sylhet; Madras; Bombay; the Indian States other than those in Rajasthan and Deccan.
3. Rajasthan Federation to include the various states of Rajputana and Central India.
4. Deccan States' Federation comprising Hyderabad, Mysore and Bastar States.

5. Bengal Federation: Eastern Bengal; Goalpara and Sylhet districts of Assam, Tripura and other states lying within these areas.

With regard to the working of the confederacy, the following observations were made by "A Punjabi": "In a confederation of India on the lines chalked out above, each federation joining it can have a governor-general with the governors of its provincial units under him, responsible to the central confederal authority in relation to the confederal subjects and matters related to the rights and obligations of the crown in respect of the Indian states within the federation. The confederal authority can be vested in the Viceroy, assisted by a confederal assembly consisting of members drawn from the various Indian Federations. The number of such members to be drawn from a federation can be fixed according to its importance judged from the point of view of its significance to the confederacy as regards its geographical situation in the Subcontinent, population, area and economic position, etc. Foreign relations, defence and matters relating to water supply from the common natural sources and rights and obligations of the Crown in relation to the Indian States (which may join any of the British provinces' federations) can be entrusted to their governor-generals, who will be responsible to the Viceroy. The various federations joining the confederacy can either directly contribute towards the revenues of the confederacy or assign some portions of their revenues from some specific heads towards its expenses.

"We may also point out here that under no circumstances should the Muslim North-West consent to assign customs as a source of the confederal revenues. Such an assignment would mean no control over the tariff policy. In the case of customs remaining a central subject, the Muslims of the North-West would permanently ruin their future prospects of industrialization." (pp. 10—12).

The following extract from the same book gives an insight into the mind of the author as well as throws light on his attitude to "Pakistan": "We should be separationists-cum-confederationists, and if the Hindus disagree with the idea of a confederacy of Hindu India and Muslim India, then we should be simply separationists,

demanding secession of our regions from Hindu India without any link between them. We should desire separation simply because we want to evolve a happier and more contented India, whether be it by separation of the Hindu cultural zones and Muslim cultural zones to be linked together in a confederacy, quite independent of and separate from each other, except for the confederal bond, or complete separation in order to constitute our regions into federated states independently and separately from Hindu India. The foreign element amongst us is quite negligible and we are as much sons of the soil as the Hindus are. Ultimately, our destiny lies within India and not out of it. And it is for this reason that we have abstained from using the word 'Pakistan' and have instead used the word 'Industan' to denote the North-West Muslim Bloc. 'Pakistan' is a term which has somehow or the other gathered round itself some unwholesome and alien associations which are far from our mind." (pp. 17-18).

Sir Sikandar's Regional Scheme

Close on the heels of the "Confederacy of India" appeared "Outlines of a Scheme of Indian Federation" by Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan. That envisaged a two-tier federation—a regional and an All-India Federation. India was to be divided into the following seven zones:

- Zone 1 Assam + Bengal (minus one or two western districts) + Bengal states and Sikkim.
- Zone 2 Bihar + Orissa (plus the area transferred from Bengal to Orissa).
- Zone 3 United Provinces and States within that province.
- Zone 4 Madras + Travancore + Madras States and Coorg.
- Zone 5 Bombay + Hyderabad + Western India States + Bombay States + Mysore and C.P. States.
- Zone 6 Rajputana States (minus Bikaner and Jaisalmer) + Gwalior + Central India States + Bihar and Orissa States + Central Provinces and Berar.
- Zone 7 Punjab + Sind + N.W.F.P. + Kashmir + Punjab States + Baluchistan + Bikaner and Jaisalmer.

Other features of the scheme were as follows:

1. Each Zone to have a regional legislature comprising representatives of all units namely the provinces and states.
2. Members of the regional legislatures to constitute the Central Federal Assembly with the provision that two-thirds would belong to the provinces and one-third to the states. Further it was provided that one-third of the total membership would consist of Muslims.
3. The Federal Executive to be headed by the Viceroy, was to include at least one representative from each zone and at least a third of the ministers so appointed were to be Muslims.
4. Defence, Foreign Affairs, Communications, Customs, Coinage and Currency to be Federal subjects.
5. Other subjects included in the Federal list under the Government of India Act, 1935, to be transferred to the units or zones.
6. Residuary powers to vest in the units.

A Comparison

During those days Mamdote Villa was buzzing with political activity. Pir Ali Mohammad Rashidi lived in the annexe of the Villa, and several League workers used to visit him. They included Mian Kifayat Ali (A Punjabi), Mr. Khalil-ur-Rahman who later became Pakistan's Ambassador to Rangoon, Mr. Mahbub Ahmad, who after a couple of years was elected as Joint Secretary of the All-India Muslim League, the author of this book, and a number of others. All of us discussed at length the two schemes, and a draft manuscript of an article comparing the two schemes was compiled and sent to the press under my name. A portion of that article is reproduced to gauge the reaction of young Leaguers:

"According to the seven regional schemes, the population percentage of the Muslims in this region will be 64.3 and that of non-Muslims 35.7. This non-Muslim minority is already much in advance of the Muslims, educationally and economically. With the weightage that will have to be conceded to it, will assume

dangerous proportions and will be a source of constant trouble to the Muslim majority in this region.

"According to the Mamdote scheme, the population percentage of the Muslims is 80 as against 20 of the non-Muslims in this region .... of the seven regions in which India is proposed to be divided, there will not be even one region where the strength of the Muslim majority will be fully reflected. The Mamdote scheme aims at shaking the balance of communal powers in the Muslim North-West by further reducing the strength of the non-Muslims. The seven-region scheme aims at raising the scale of the non-Muslims minority still higher by bringing in the Punjab Hindu states and the Hindu States of Bikaner and Jaisalmer in the Muslim North-West .... according to the seven-region scheme, defence, foreign relations, tariff, communications and currency will be central subjects. In (Mamdote Scheme) special stress has been laid on the necessity of keeping tariffs as a federal subject. This has been done to safeguard the agricultural and industrial interests of the Muslim North-West .... Sir Sikandar proposes to include communications in the list of central subjects. If this were done, it would reduce the importance of Karachi as a key port and the benefit accruing from it by the exclusive control of customs, for it will enable the inhabitants of other regions to import their manufactures from over the land frontiers. In other words, it would mean little customs income from Karachi, which is calculated to be 10 to 15 crores. It would also mean giving up about 6 crore of rupees which represents the net profits of the North-Western Railway. The evil which is sought to be eliminated by the segregation of the Muslim provinces from Hindu India will thus reappear in an aggravated form." (*Eastern Times*—date not known—1939).

Khaliquzzaman

Ch. Khaliquzzaman states in his memoirs that in March 1939, he, along with Mr. Abdur Rahman Siddiqi, first met Col. Muirhead, Under-Secretary of State for India, and discussed the future of Muslims in the Subcontinent and when asked for an alternative,

Khaliquzzaman "went up to the map of India which was hanging in his room and pointed out the two areas, north-west and east, which were Muslim areas and which might be separated from the rest of India". Col. Muirhead arranged their interview with Lord Zetland, Secretary of State for India, so that they could discuss the proposal with him directly. Lord Zetland, too, in the course of the discussion, sought an alternative to which Khaliquzzaman gave this reply: "You may partition the Muslim areas from the rest of India and proceed with your scheme of Federation of the Indian provinces without including the Muslim areas which should be independent from the rest." When questioned about the position of states, Khaliquzzaman said: "They ought to follow their geographical situation. If they are in the Hindu zone, they must go with them and if they are in the Muslim zone, they must go with that zone." Asked about Defence, Chaudhary Sahib said that as long as the British were associated with the administration of India, they could use the armies of both these areas according to their needs, but nothing could be said about the time when the British were not in any way connected with the administration of the subcontinent. (pp. 204—6)

What Khaliquzzaman has failed to state in his memoirs is the fact that his scheme included the existence of a centre. This is disclosed by Lord Zetland who says: "They replied that they had, and what they would propose would be the establishment of three or four federations of provinces and states which would be co-ordinated by a small central body of some kind or another. The whole object of the scheme was, of course, to give the Muslims as great a measure of control at the centre as the Hindus. (Quoted by Pirzada, p. 164).

Dr. Syed Abdul Latif

Dr. Syed Abdul Latif, an educationist of repute, published his scheme in 1939 in a book entitled "A Federation of Cultural Zones for India". According to that the Indian Federation was to comprise four Muslim cultural zones and eleven Hindu cultural

zones. The Muslim Zones were to be as follows:

1. North-West bloc embracing the Punjab, Sind, N.W.F.P., Baluchistan and the States of Khairpur and Bahawalpur and covering a population of 25 million Muslims.
2. The North-East bloc consisting of East Bengal and Assam covering a population of over 30 million Muslims.
3. The Delhi-Lucknow bloc extending from the eastern border of Patiala to Lucknow and rounding up Rampur on the way. This aimed at covering 12 million Muslims of the United Provinces and Bihar through migration.
4. The Deccan bloc embracing the state of Hyderabad and a strip of territory in the south with an opening to the sea. More than 12 million Muslims were expected to be covered thus.

Other features of the scheme were:

(i) Defence, Foreign Affairs, Commerce and Communications to be the subjects of the Federation.

(ii) Residuary powers to vest in provinces.

(iii) Establishment of Regional Boards of contiguous federal units to evolve common policies on the subjects of cultural and economic importance.

(iv) The Executive or Cabinet chosen for every province and the Centre to be a composite one representing the Hindus and the Muslims with an agreed policy acceptable to both, and not liable to be turned out by the legislature.

Abul-Ala Maududi

The role of Maulana Syed Abul-Ala Maududi in the partition of the Subcontinent has rather remained obscure. However, one thing is clear that the Maulana in 1938 and 1939 wrote a series of articles unmasking the Congress and warning Muslims of the unsuitability of India for democratic rule as there would be only one Muslim vote against four Hindu votes. Mr. Sharifuddin Pirzada has quoted the following from "Chiragh-i-Rah" (Pakistan Number, 1960): "He condemned the national imperialism of the Hindus and opined that separate electorates, weightage in Assembly seats

and reservation of proportion in services could not solve the political problems of the Muslim Nation. His proposals embodied three alternatives:

(a) An international federation which should be a state of Federated Nations wherein each nation should be sovereign and should enjoy cultural autonomy.

(b) The scheme envisaged in the Cultural Future of India prepared by Dr. Latif should be implemented and separate regions be demarcated for establishment of autonomous states of respective nationalities. The Centre should retain minimum subjects. A period of 25 years should be provided for exchange of population between them. East Bengal, Hyderabad, Bhopal, Junagarh, Chendra, Tonk, Ajmer, Delhi, Oudh, North-West Punjab, Sind and Baluchistan, should be assigned to the Muslims. Separate regions should be allocated to the Sikhs and the Depressed Classes if they so desire.

OR

(c) If the first two alternatives are not acceptable, then there should be separate National Federal States of Hindus and Muslims respectively, with a confederacy between the two. There should be a pact or treaty between the Federations regarding Defence, Communications, Trade and Commerce. (p. 192).

Although all these schemes visualised a subcontinent-wise federal or confederal bond between the Hindu and Muslim regions, there was virtually no response from the Congress or the Hindu community. In fact, almost all the schemes were dubbed as Pakistan which had become a nightmare for the Hindu press and politicians.

FROM PAKISTAN CALIPHATE TO PAKASIA

THERE were a number of plans that stood for complete independence of the Muslim states with no federal or confederal bond with Hindu India. They were utopian in the sense that in carving out the areas of Muslim domination neither the population factor was kept in view nor the contiguity of the Muslim-majority areas. They were based more on unlimited ambition than on practicability.

One example was the *Khilafat-i-Pakistan* Scheme presented by the Punjab Muslim Students Federation in 1939 when its leadership changed hands. The 44-page pamphlet entitled *Khilafat-i-Pakistan* scheme had on its title cover a map showing a large Pakistan that included not only the North-West and the North-East regions but also parts of the United Provinces and the Central Provinces and Berar. Thus it was an unbroken belt of territories of Northern India extending from Baluchistan to Bengal and Assam. The rest of the Subcontinent was given the name of God's earth or territory. The author condemned the "defensive mentality" of the Muslim leadership which had involved the nation in safeguards and concessions for a period of 75 years; pointed out flaws in the schemes presented by Rahmat Ali, Dr. Syed Abdul Latif, Nawab Sir Shahnawaz Khan of Mamdote and Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan and said that what was aimed at was a strong ideological Muslim base, from where a programme of "world conquest" could be launched.

It was said that the constitution of the state should be based on *Khilafat*, a blend of democracy and dictatorship. The leader of the nation and the state would be an *Amir-ul-Momineen* who would be the shadow of God on earth and a deputy of the Prophet Mohammad (peace be upon him). He shall be a Pope and a Caesar

combined and would be bound by the Quranic Law. There would be a *Shura* (advisory committee) consisting of the best brains in addition to the consultants nominated by the *Amir*. For every subject there would be sub-committees to which representation would be given on the principle of interests—and not on the basis of members. The economic system was to have the following salient features:

1. Interest shall be banned.
2. All land would belong to the God's Caliph and, therefore, under the control of *Bait-ul-Mal.*
3. All big industries and public utilities shall be nationalised.
4. Muslims shall be habituated to deposit all surplus money with the *Bait-ul-Mal.*

It was said that non-Muslims shall not have the right to vote and those seeking exemption from military service shall have to pay *Jaziya* or Poll Tax as provided in the Shariah.

This scheme received big publicity, but only on account of its novelty. Otherwise it was not taken seriously. Schemes of a similar nature were proposed by Maulana Abdul Wadud and Maulana Azad Subhani. The terminology of *Hukumat-i-Ilahiya* and *Hukumat-i-Rabbani* was used by a few but it had virtually no impact on the people.

Aligarh Scheme

Syed Zafar-ul-Hasan and Dr. Mohammad Afzal Husain Qadri, professors in the Aligarh University, wrote a booklet in 1939 entitled "The Problem of Indian Muslims and its Solution". The scheme it presented was popularly known as the Aligarh Scheme. According to that the map of the Subcontinent was to be like this:

1. *Pakistan Federation* in the north-west of India including the united Punjab, Sind, N.W.F.P., Baluchistan, all states within these provinces and the Jammu and Kashmir state. (Muslim population: 60 per cent).

2. *Bengal* including Purnea district from Bihar and Sylhet division from Assam but excluding some south-western districts. (Muslim population: 57 per cent).

3. *Hindustan* comprising the rest of British India but two new autonomous provinces were proposed, namely: (a) Delhi province including Delhi, Meerut division, Rohilkhand division and the district of Aligarh (Muslim population: 28 per cent), and (b) Malabar province in south India (Muslim population: 27 per cent).

4. *Hyderabad* with its old dominions of Berar and Karnatik to be a sovereign state.

5. The native states inside the boundaries of Pakistan, Bengal and Hindustan to form part of the respective states. Those on the border to have the right to join either of the three states.

6. All cities or towns in Hindu India having 50,000 or more population to be given the status of free cities or boroughs having their own police and magistracy and power to legislate on their local matters.

7. Muslims in negligible minority living in the rural areas of Hindustan to be induced to aggregate in villages with a preponderant Muslim population.

8. The minorities in Pakistan, Bengal and Hindustan to have effective safeguards on reciprocal basis as well as representation according to population through separate electorates.

9. Muslims in Hindustan to be treated as a nation in minority and part of a larger nation inhabiting Pakistan and Bengal.

10. Hindus and Muslims to have the right to migrate to their homelands if and when they want to do so.

Rahmat Ali's New Proposals

On March 8, 1940, Rahmat Ali addressing a meeting of the Supreme Council of the Pakistan National Movement held at Karachi unfolded Part II of the Pak Plan by proposing two more Muslim States, namely, *Bang-i-Islam* (Bengal) and *Osmanistan* (Hyderabad Deccan). For the latter, a voluntary exchange of Hindu population with Muslim population of the neighbouring regions was suggested.

Later he issued "Seven Commandments of Destiny" which could be thus summarised:

1. *Avoid "Minorityism"*: We must not leave our minorities in Hindu lands nor must we keep non-Muslim minorities in our own lands.

2. *Avow Nationalism*: It means that we must assent, and demand the recognition of the distinct national status of our minorities in the Hindu-majority regions and reciprocally offer to give similar status to Hindu and Sikh minorities in Pakistan, Bangistan and Osmanistan.

3. *Acquire Proportional Territory to create Siddiqistan, Faruqistan, Haideristan, Muinistan, Maplistan, Safi-istan and Nasaristan*: In justification of this proposal, Rahmat Ali wrote in *The Millat and the Mission*, as follows: "Now in the orbit of Pakasia we form about one-fourth of the total population and, according to the laws of Nature and nations, are entitled to about one-fourth of its area. Out of this, we shall get in Pakistan, Bangistan and Osmanistan about 325,000 square miles—after giving the Hindu and Sikh minorities their proportional share of the area of these lands. So roughly speaking, the area we shall actually receive in Pakistan, Bangistan and Osmanistan will be about 75,000 square miles less than that which is really due to us. It is acquisition of this area and its conversion into Muslim countries that are made our obligation by the Commandment." (pp. 13-14).

Then he said that the Muslims constituted fifteen per cent of the population of the United Provinces, therefore, they be allocated 15 per cent area for the establishment of a state named Haideristan. He further said: "In the same way, the proportional areas for our minorities in the Central Provinces, Bundhelkhand and Malwa, Bihar and Orissa, Rajistan, the Bombay Presidency and South India, Western Ceylon and Eastern Ceylon must be claimed and converted into our new national countries of Siddiqistan, Farooqistan, Muinistan, Maplistan, Safi-istan and Nasaristan respectively." (p. 14).

4. *Consolidate the Individual Nations:* The sooner we realize that such unification and consolidation is vital to our national honour and existence, the better for us all.

5. *Co-ordinate the Nations under a Pak Commonwealth of Nations:* To us, the Pakasians, union is not only a source of strength, but also a sacred duty . . . . we must bring together in an international organization at least our ten countries. . . . It should be understood that the central object being co-operation between our nations in Pakasia, no sanctity attaches to the form of this institution. Indeed, if the nations like, they can make it instead a confederation or league of nations. Only, whatever they do, they must remember that a commonwealth gives the *Millat* all the advantages of a confederation or of a league without most of the disadvantages of either. For, constitutionally speaking, while the creation of a confederation is difficult owing to the lack of contiguity of the countries and the very conception of a league is fraught with the danger of its disruption, the core of a commonwealth is free from the difficulty of one and from the danger of the other, but also assures the stability and success of the institution itself.

6. *Convert the Subcontinent of India into the Continent of Dinia:* Chaudhry Rahmat Ali was opposed to the word India. He called the subcontinent as DINIA, meaning a land of various "Dins" or faiths. He said: " . . . . we must write *finis* to the most deceptive fiction that 'India' is the sphere of 'Indianism'."

7. *Organize the Continent of Dinia and its Dependencies into the Orbit of Pakasia:* He said: " . . . . to organize Dinia and its dependencies into Pakasia, is merely to recognise the truths and trends of its history. I mean the truths that have sprung from the heroic deeds of our *Millat* and shaped the cultural identity of Dinia; and the trends that are created by our dynamic ideas and are directing its cultural future in the world . . . . it is a duty in the performance of which lies not only the present security of the *Millat's* culture but also the future success of her civilization in Pakistan."

We have done our best to present Rahmat Ali's views in his own language and in a highly abridged form. These are based on two of his pamphlets—"The Millat and the Mission" and "India: The Continent of Dinia or the Continent of Doom" published in 1942 and 1945, respectively. On each of the states proposed by him, he published separate pamphlets.

Chaudhry Rahmat Ali remained the focus of attention only during the first phase of his activities where he suggested the establishment of an independent Muslim State in North-West of India and gave it the name of Pakistan. As public opinion grew in support of a separate state or states and a number of schemes came before the public eye, the name of Rahmat Ali receded into the background, and after the Lahore Resolution was passed and the battle for Pakistan had begun, Rahmat Ali's name went into oblivion. His ideas on the Pakasia commonwealth, and carving out of small states within Hindu India and his seven commandments did not receive any notice worth the name. This was because the battle for Pakistan was fought by the Muslim League under the leadership of the Quaid-i-Azam on the basis of the right of self-determination and Rahmat Ali had nothing to do with the League. He had a highly exaggerated notion of the influence of his Pakistan National Movement. In actual practice, whatever little following he had swung towards the Muslim League. That caused frustration, of which one finds a lot in his book *Pakistan* published in 1944 including some unwholesome remarks against the Quaid-i-Azam.

However, in the history of the idea of Pakistan, Chaudhry Rahmat Ali occupies an important place because:

1. He was the first to make a sustained effort in the direction of establishing a Muslim State in the North-West of India.

2. He gave the name Pakistan to the state, which though avoided by the League leadership for pretty long, had ultimately to be adopted.

3. It was through his efforts that long before the League adopted it as its ideal and launched a full-fledged movement, the word Pakistan was known internationally.

4. He was the first to discard Indianism and to fight against it consistently and continuously, and he never accepted a compromise on that issue.

5. His first tract named *Now or Never* served as a basis for several League leaders and even some portions of the speeches of Quaid-i-Azam give a strong indication that he had studied the tract.

6. Though in a Utopian fashion, his endeavour had been to bring into the orbit of Pakistan the maximum number of Indian Muslims.

7. And it is an historical fact that he contributed a lot to the preparation of the ground for the Muslim League's Pakistan Movement.

LAHORE RESOLUTION

THE hour of destiny struck at the midnight of March 23, 1940, when with unprecedented enthusiasm and thunderous applause the Lahore session of the All India Muslim League passed the resolution that paved the way for a direct march towards a definite goal. The term "Pakistan" was scrupulously avoided in speeches as well as in the body of the resolution. However, next morning the Hindu press came out with the big headlines "Pakistan Resolution passed". Khaliquzzaman was very correct when he said: "The nationalist press supplied to the Muslim masses a concentrated slogan which immediately conveyed to them the idea of a state. It would have taken long for the Muslim leaders to explain the Lahore Resolution and convey its real meaning and significance to them. Years of labour of the Muslim leaders to propagate its full impact amongst the masses was shortened by the Hindu press in naming the resolution, the 'Pakistan Resolution'." (p. 237).

Some time later, the Quaid-i-Azam accepted the word in the sense that he began using the term "Lahore Resolution, popularly known as Pakistan Resolution". In the 1943 session of the All India Muslim League he made a vehement denial of the argument—"Really very wicked, the most wicked of all"—that the Muslim India was treated as "Pak" (pure) while the Hindu India was called "Na-Pak" (impure). He said: "You know perfectly well that Pakistan is a word which is really foisted on us and fathered on us by some sections of the Hindu press and also by the British press. Now our Resolution was known for a long time as the Lahore Resolution, popularly known as Pakistan. But how long are we to have this long phrase? Now I say to my Hindu and British friends: 'We thank you for giving us one word'."

Before we take up the text of the Lahore Resolution, it seems necessary to have a bird's-eye view of the events preceding its adoption. In a previous chapter, it has already been mentioned that the Sind Provincial Muslim League had recommended to the All-India Muslim League to consider the idea of a separate Muslim state or states. In December 1938, the Patna session of the League authorised the President to adopt such course as might be necessary with a view to exploring a suitable alternative to the Government of India Act of 1935 which would safeguard the interests of Muslims and other minorities. When a number of schemes for the Partition came into being, the League Working Committee appointed a committee headed by the Quaid-i-Azam and with Liaquat Ali Khan as convener to examine and report on the various draft schemes "already propounded by those who are fully versed in the constitutional developments of India and other countries of the world and those that may be submitted hereafter . . ." At the time of the ratification of that resolution, Quaid-i-Azam told the League Council as follows: "In regard to Federation, there are several schemes in the field including that of dividing the country into Muslim India and Hindu India. These schemes were before the Committee which had been set up by the Working Committee of the League. The Committee was not pledged to any particular scheme. It would examine the whole question and produce a scheme which, according to the Committee, would be in the best interests of the Muslims of India." It may here be noted that this committee never presented a scheme.

Khaliquzzaman tells us that at a meeting of the Working Committee held on February 4, 1940, he pleaded for suggesting an alternative to the "Federal Objective". He says: "I also pointed out to the members that recently Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan had published a scheme for the future constitution of India in which he had proposed division of India into seven different zones, and had also provided for a confederal structure. Personally, I said, I would suggest confining our demands to the separation of Muslim Zones, *viz*., N.W.F.P., Sind, Baluchistan and Punjab in the north-west and Bengal and Assam in the east and leave the rest to the

Congress to deal with. At this stage Sir Sikandar who was sitting to the right of the Quaid-i-Azam started pleading for his confederal scheme and the Quaid opposing it. The discussion went on for about two hours when finally, with the concurrence of the members, the Quaid rejected Sir Sikandar's scheme and entered in his notebook my suggestion with approval." (pp. 233-34). A couple of days later the Quaid-i-Azam met the Viceroy and told him that the Muslim League at its open session on March 23 was going to ask for the partition of the country.

The question crops up: Who drafted the Lahore Resolution? The answer is: Not the Committee appointed in 1939, because the Quaid-i-Azam indicated in his address that no final scheme had emerged from the Committee; nor Khaliquzzaman, because he says that on account of his daughter's marriage he reached the session when the draft was already prepared. There was only one person, who, a year later, claimed to have drafted the resolution but only partly. It was Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan. Khalid Bin Sayeed has quoted the following statement of Sir Sikandar from the Punjab Assembly Debates dated March 11, 1941: "I have no hesitation in admitting that I was responsible for drafting the original resolution. But let me make it clear that the resolution which I drafted was radically amended by the Working Committee, and there is a wide divergence in the resolution I drafted and the one that was finally passed. The main difference between the two resolutions is that the later part of my resolution which related to the centre and co-ordination of the various units, was eliminated." (p. 122).

And now let us come to the text of the Resolution itself, which is as follows:

> "While approving and endorsing the action taken by the Council and the Working Committee of the All India Muslim League as indicated in their Resolutions dated the 27 August, 17 and 18 September and 22 October 1939, and 3 February 1940 on the constitutional issue, this session of the All India Muslim League emphatically

reiterates that the scheme of federation embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935 is totally unsuited to and unworkable in the peculiar conditions of this country and is altogether unacceptable to Muslim India.

"It further records its emphatic view that while the declaration dated the 18 October, 1939 made by the Viceroy on behalf of His Majesty's Government is reassuring insofar as it declares that the policy and plan on which the Government of India Act 1935 is based will be reconsidered in consultation with the various parties interests and communities in India; Muslim India will not be satisfied unless the whole constitutional plan is reconsidered *de novo* and that no revised plan should be acceptable to the Muslims unless it is framed with their approval and consent.

"Resolved that it is the considered view of this Session of the All India Muslim League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to the Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principles, *viz.*, that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted, with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North-Western and Eastern Zones of India should be grouped to constitute "Independent States" in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign.

"That adequate effective and mandatory safeguards should be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in these units and in the regions for the protection for their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them, and in other parts of India where the Mussalmans are in a minority adequate effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specifically provided in the constitution

for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them.

"This Session further authorizes the Working Committee to frame a scheme of constitution in accordance with these basic principles, providing for the assumption finally by the respective regions of all powers such as defence, external affairs, communications, customs and such other matters as may be necessary."

The text shows that: (a) the word "provinces" was avoided and in its place the word "units" was used; (b) the units were to be grouped to constitute Independent States; (c) the constituent units were to be autonomous and sovereign; (d) the respective regions or in other words the states were to assume finally all powers such as defence, external affairs, communications, customs and such other matters as may be necessary.

Instead of the provinces, the word units was used perhaps because of the visualised territorial readjustments and also because the native states within or contiguous to the regions or zones were to be included.

To say that the constituent units were to be sovereign was rather anomalous. In his book "The Meaning of Pakistan", Mr. Durrani says: "The last word sovereign is obviously misplaced as areas which are going to be the constituent units of another sovereign state cannot themselves be sovereign, though they can certainly be autonomous. In fact, the whole final clause is irrelevant and was probably inserted to reassure the representatives of Sind, Baluchistan and the N.W.F.P. about their own provincial autonomy. The resolution was intended to define the areas of Pakistan as being distinct from Hindustan and not to state at that stage what the inner structure of the resultant Pakistan state would be." (pp. 183-84). Maybe, this is correct but there could be another interpretation as well. To my mind, the Quaid-i-Azam visualised the establishment of Pakistan through stages and his acceptance of the Cabinet Mission Proposals is a pointer in that direction. Moreover, his casual remark made to his Naval A.D.C., Mr. Ahsan, on reaching the

Government House at Karachi was significant because he said: "I never expected to see Pakistan in my life-time. We have to be very grateful to God for what we have achieved." (Bolitho, p. 195). Perhaps he thought that if the units became autonomous or sovereign in their first stage, their secession from India would be facilitated and the Muslim majority units would, in course of time, be in a position to form a separate federation of their own.

The use of the words "Independent States" caused a certain amount of confusion which requires clarification. It was stated in the resolution that the respective regions or in other words the Independent States would assume finally all powers such as defence, external affairs, communications, customs and such other matters as may be necessary. Obviously, a federal structure was aimed at for such powers vest in the centre in all countries where a federal system is in vogue and because the resolution called for *one* scheme of the constitution. It can also be interpreted that each region or Independent State was to assume these powers because the constituent elements were called units. That interpretation poses a number of questions such as: whether two separate independent states were envisaged or a single federal state was aimed at or if former was the case what sort of relationship between the two states was visualised. As the Lahore Resolution does not clearly answer these questions, it becomes imperative to make a careful study of the explanations and elucidations made from time to time by the Quaid-i-Azam and other leaders of the Muslim League.

Having been one of the hundreds of delegates to the Lahore session of the All-India Muslim League, I could say without any hesitation that none of my young fellow delegates delved into the wording of the Lahore Resolution and we all had the impression that a single state was aimed at. Secondly, if we look at the speeches made on the Resolution as recorded in the Foundations of Pakistan, Vol. II, we find that Choudhry Khaliquzzaman spoke of "their own Government, where they are in majority". Sardar Aurangzeb Khan, leader of the opposition in the N.W.F.P. Assembly, said: ". . . . we want a home for the Muslim nation, and our home is as indicated in the resolution". Haji Abdullah Haroon mentioned

states in plural but in reference to a resolution passed by the Sind Muslim League in 1938. The other supporters of the resolution did not speak of one or two states, but I clearly remember that Maulana Zafar Ali Khan began his speech with the sentence that he felt as if he was breathing in the atmosphere of an Islamic State. However, the reported text attributes the statement to him that "he was on this day feeling as if he was speaking from a free India".

The Quaid-i-Azam's presidential address at the occasion was more than clear on the point. He said: "Mussalmans are a nation according to any definition of a nation, and they must have their homelands, their territory and their state." Further he declared, "There is no reason why these states should be antagonistic to each other. On the other hand, the rivalry and the natural desire and efforts on the part of the one (community) to dominate the social order and establish political supremacy over the other in the Government of the country will disappear. It will lead more towards natural goodwill by international pacts between them (states) and they can live in complete harmony with their neighbours. This will lead further to a friendly settlement all the more easily with regard to minorities by reciprocal arrangements and adjustments between the Muslim India and the Hindu India, which will far more adequately and effectively safeguard the rights and interests of Muslims and various other minorities."

Then a careful study of Quaid-i-Azam's presidential address at the twenty-eighth session of the All India Muslim League held at Madras in April 1941 illustrates the meaning of the Lahore Resolution in a clear manner and one could understand as to what was meant when the words "Independent States" was used. Here are the two extracts: ". . . . the goal of the Muslim League is as follows: We want the establishment of completely independent states in the North-Western and eastern zones of India with full control of Defence, Foreign Affairs, Communications, Customs, Currency, Exchange, etc., and we do not want, under the circumstances, a constitution of an All-India character, with one Government at the centre". Further, he said: "And now let me say that the ideology of this League is based on the fundamental principle

that Muslims of India are an independent nationality, and any attempt to get them to merge their national and political identity and unity will not only be resisted, but in my opinion, it will be futile for anyone to attempt it. We are determined that there should be no mistake in establishing the status of an independent nation and an independent state in this subcontinent."

In the same Madras session, Lahore Resolution was made the creed of the Muslim League and its major portion was adopted as one of the aims and objects of the League. It is significant to note that the word "together" was added after the word "grouped". Thus the draft took the following form: "North-Western and Eastern zones of India shall be grouped *together* to constitute Independent States as Muslim Free National Homelands in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign."

Other Side of the Picture

There was another side of the picture as well. The whole history of the idea of Pakistan shows that never in the past a close link between the two wings was envisaged. When Iqbal in 1930 attempted to call a Conference of Muslim-majority provinces, he named it Upper India Muslim Conference and excluded Bengal from that, although he obviously knew that it was a Muslim-majority province and its cause was common with the Muslim-majority provinces in the north-west of India. In the Allahabad Address he did not refer to any possible link between the North-Western Muslim State and Bengal. In his letters to the Quaid-i-Azam, he said: "Why should not the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal be considered as Nations entitled to self-determination just as other nations in India and outside India are? (p. 22). A cursory study of the various schemes of partition surveyed in the previous chapters shows that while all visualised at least two states—one in the north-west and the other in the north-east, none envisages a federal bond or even a confederal bond between the two. Chaudhry Rahmat Ali firmly rejected a confederation of Muslim States and what he proposed was a commonwealth of independent and sovereign Muslim countries of the subcontinent.

In view of this historical perspective it is not at all surprising that Lahore Resolution was interpreted as a plan for two independent and sovereign Muslim states. Of the League leaders, Mr. Abdul Hamid Khan, Chairman, Reception Committee of the Madras Session of the All India Muslim League, 1941, in the course of his address expressed the opinion that the Lahore Resolution implied "the establishment of independent and separate Muslim states with a confederating outlook". (*Foundations of Pakistan*, Vol. II, p. 356).

We can find more light on the subject if we glance through the books written by Muslim intellectuals during the Pakistan Movement. Of these the name of M.R.T. stands high, for the Quaid-i-Azam had a special liking for his writings. When the Quaid compiled in a book form literature on Lahore Resolution under the title *India's Problem of the Future Constitution*, he included in that four articles by M.R.T. And when M.R.T. wrote a book : *Pakistan and Muslim India* in 1942, the Quaid-i-Azam wrote the Preface to that and said: ". . . . but fortunately the Muslim homelands are in the North-Western and Eastern Zones of the subcontinent where they are in a solid majority of nearly seventy millions and they desire that these parts should be separated from the rest of India and constituted into *independent sovereign states*". The author repeatedly speaks of two Pakistan States and deals with them separately in two chapters. In the chapter on North-Western Muslim Zone he writes: ". . . . The N.W. Muslim Zone . . . . includes many Indian states (native states) . . . . all these states shall be represented in the Pakistan Federal Assembly as independent and autonomous units. The Pakistan Government will not interfere in their internal affairs and will only exercise control over matters specially delegated to it with the consent of their rulers. These matters will include defence, foreign affairs, communications, customs and currency." (pp. 115-16).

In the chapter on the Eastern Muslim Zone, he makes a comparison between the Eastern Pakistan States and the Western Pakistan States. In the course of that he writes: "In case of Western

Pakistan, we conceive of a federation with residuary powers vested in the autonomous units, but the Eastern Pakistan State will have a unitarian constitution with a strong and powerful centre." (p. 119). In the chapter on the economic position, the author uses the terms "Pakistan Federation" and "Pakistan Government" for West Pakistan only and concludes as follows: "We close this narrative with the confidence that the Pakistan States will make rapid strides in the economic field and will, besides developing their agricultural wealth, take their place in due course among the advanced countries of the world."

In February, 1946, a book named *Common Sense on Pakistan*, by Dr. G.M.D. Sufi appeared from Bombay. The author says: "The term Pakistan is appropriately applied to the north zone. No such simple term has been in use for Bengal and Assam. I would propose 'Nuristan, (pronunciation—Nooristaan), meaning the land of light or lustre, as Bengal and Assam receive the rays of the sun prior to any other province of India." (p. 74).

A couple of months later another book *Why Pakistan* emerged from Calcutta under the authorship of S. Rahman and with a Foreword by Husain Shaheed Suhrawardy, who considered it "a reasoned book" and recommended it to "those who wish to know the case for Pakistan". The chapter discussing the Shape of Pakistan visualises three fully independent and sovereign states namely Muslim Pakistan State of the north-western zone, the Muslim Pakistan State of the eastern zone and the Hindustan state. After that the author says: "....This is, again, necessary to make it clear that both the Pakistan States will also be separate independent and sovereign states and mutual relations between them will be governed by .... treaties and agreements."

Mr. Rahman, the author, proposed outlines of the federal constitutions for the two states. He said that "the Muslim state which will be formed in the north-western zones, may be named Pakistan". (p. 87). After discussing the salient features of its constitution, he comes to the Eastern Muslim state and says: "The independent and sovereign Muslim state which will be formed in the eastern zone, comprising Bengal and Assam and

Muslim majority areas of Arakan (which will become a part of Bengal), may be named BANGSAM, a combination of the names of both the provinces. Some people are in favour of naming it as Eastern Pakistan, but while Pakistan of the north-western zone will be a quite separate, independent and sovereign state with no direct connection with this eastern Muslim State, excepting some treaty obligations and agreements, we do not see any reason of adopting such a name which will, at least outwardly, indicate 'oneness' of both the states." (p. 91).

Resolution at Legislators' Convention

The state or states controversy came to an end when the Muslim League Legislators' Convention in April 1946 adopted a resolution that clearly called for one Pakistan. The contents of this resolution are more all-embracing than the Lahore Resolution, because it covers the ideological aspect as well. The full text is as follows:

"Whereas in this vast subcontinent of India, a hundred million Muslims are the adherents of a faith that regulates every department of their life (educational, social, economic and political), whose code is not confined merely to spiritual doctrines and tenets or rituals and ceremonies and which stands in sharp contrast to the exclusive nature of Hindu *Dharama* and philosophy which has fostered and maintained for thousands of years a rigid caste system resulting in the degradation of sixty million human beings to the position of untouchables, creation of unnatural barriers between man and man and super-imposition of social and economic inequalities on a large body of the people of this country, and which threatens to reduce Muslims, Christians and other minorities to the status of irredeemable helots, socially and economically;

"Whereas, the Hindu Caste system is a direct negation of nationalism, equality, democracy and all the noble ideals that Islam stands for;

"Whereas different historical backgrounds, traditions, cultures, social and economic orders of the Hindus and Muslims have made impossible the evolution of a single Indian nation inspired by

common aspirations and ideals and whereas after centuries they still remain two distinct major nations;

"Whereas, soon after the introduction by the British of the policy of setting up political institutions in India on the lines of Western democracies based on majority rule which meant that the majority of one nation or society could impose its will on the other nation or society, inspite of their opposition as was amply demonstrated during the two and a half years' regime of Congress Government in the Hindu-majority provinces under the Government of India Act, 1935, when the Muslims were subjected to untold harassment and oppression as a result of which they were convinced of the futility and ineffectiveness of the so-called safeguards provided in the constitution and in the Instruments of Instruction to the Governors and were driven to the irresistible conclusion that in a united India Federation, if established, the Muslims, even in majority provinces, would meet with no better fate and their interests could never be adequately protected against the perpetual Hindu majority at the centre;

"Whereas the Muslims are convinced that with a view to save Muslim India from the domination of the Hindus and in order to afford them full scope to develop themselves according to their genius, it is necessary to constitute a sovereign independent State comprising Bengal and Assam in the North-East zone; and the Punjab, N.W.F.P., Sind and Baluchistan in the North-West zone:

"This convention of the Muslim League Legislators of India, Central and Provincial, after careful consideration hereby declares that the Muslim Nation will never submit to any constitution for a united India and will never participate in any single constitution-making machinery set up for the purpose, and that any formula devised by the British Government for transferring power from the British to the peoples of India, which does not conform to the following just and equitable principles, calculated to maintain internal peace and tranquillity in the country, will not contribute to the solution of the Indian problem:

(1) That the zones comprising Bengal and Assam in the

North-East and the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind, Baluchistan in the North-West of India, namely, Pakistan zones where the Muslims are in a dominant majority, be constituted into a sovereign independent state and that an unequivocal undertaking be given to implement the establishment of Pakistan without delay;

(2) That two separate constitution-making bodies be set up by people of Pakistan and Hindustan for the purpose of framing their respective constitutions;

(3) That the minorities in Pakistan and Hindustan be provided with safeguards on the lines of the All India Muslim League Resolution passed on March 23, 1940, at Lahore;

(4) That the acceptance of the Muslim League demand of Pakistan and its implementation without delay are the *sine qua non* for the Muslim League cooperation and participation in the formation of an interim Government at the Centre.

"This Convention further emphatically declares that any attempt to impose a constitution on a united India basis or to force any interim arrangement at the centre, contrary to the Muslim League demand, will leave the Muslims with no alternative but to resist such imposition by all possible means for their survival and national existence."

The resolution was drafted by Khaliquzzaman, discussed by a sub-committee, headed by Nawab Ismail Khan with Hasan Ispahani, Abdul Matin Chaudhri, I.I. Chundrigar and Khaliquzzaman. Then it came to the Subjects Committee and after that to the open session of the legislators, where it was formally moved by Husain Shaheed Suhrawardy. It is interesting to note that on April 3, 1946, Mr. Suhrawardy wrote his Foreword to S. Rahman's book *Why Pakistan*?, called it a reasoned book and commended it to those who wish to know the case for Pakistan, thereby confirming the very firm opinion of the author to the effect that Pakistan and Bangsam shall be completely separate independent states having no link with each other except some treaty obligations and agreements; and on April 9, 1946, just six days later became

the prime mover of a resolution that called for an independent and sovereign Pakistan comprising both north-western and eastern zones.

Khalid Bin Sayeed says: "Abul Hashim, a famous Muslim League leader from Bengal, made a passionate plea in favour of creating a separate Muslim state of East Bengal in the Subjects Committee of the Muslim League Legislators' Convention in April, 1946. He pointed out that the Lahore Resolution was clearly capable of such an interpretation." (pp. 123-24). Similarly, Khaliquzzaman points out: "It had been asserted in Delhi after the Convention that Mr. Abul Hashim, the Secretary of the Bengal Muslim League, had raised the question of the change from States to State. It was stated that the Quaid-i-Azam, presiding over the Convention, said that States was a misprint and there the matter ended in the Convention. Since then Mr. Abul Hashim has continued to assert that he had definitely raised the point in the Subjects Committee and had also personally talked about it to me." (p. 344).

Khaliquzzaman states and Nawab Muhammad Ismail Khan in response to his query confirms that neither in the Subjects Committee nor in the open session anyone opposed the change from States to State. After that Khaliquzzaman asked Nawab Ismail Khan to make his observation on Abul Hashim's assertion. Nawab Sahib, in his reply said: "It is possible that I was out of the room when this point was raised or that his remarks were not audible to me, because I remember I was sitting right at the back. What has really astounded me in your letter is that the Quaid-i-Azam ruled that the word States was a misprint. How can a Chairman disregard the phraseology of the written constitution on unrecorded memory of his own?" (p. 344). Nawab Ismail Khan contends if it was really a misprint, it could be rectified when the Lahore Resolution was incorporated in the League Constitution, but that was not done. Editions after editions appeared of the constitution under the direct supervision of Liaquat Ali Khan but the word States remained as it was. To that it may be added that Lahore Resolution was quoted hundreds of times in contemporary literature, in books, in newspaper articles

but the word States was not changed. However, there was one exception. In the preface to the book compiled by the Quaid-i-Azam and named *India's Problem of Her Future Constitution*, the words are Independent State not States. However, in the same book the text of the Lahore Resolution and other articles and statements contain the word States and not State. From that one could easily conclude that the misprint was in the preface.

The Resolution passed at the Legislators' Convention is also important in another respect. The clause of the Lahore Resolution "with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary" was excluded. This was probably because what was originally aimed at was a mutual territorial readjustments between Hindu India and Muslim India on give-and-take basis, but the non-Muslims began using that clause to cut the size of Pakistan to the barest minimum, which was undesirable.

It was contended by some from time to time that the Legislators' Convention being a subsidiary body of the All India Muslim League could not amend the Lahore Resolution and that the amendment could be valid only if it was passed in the open session of the League. But that was a mere constitutional quibbling. The Legislators' Convention consisted of the members freshly elected by the common people in general elections. It was, therefore, much more representative of the nation than the Council of All India Muslim League or an open session of the organization; therefore, the Convention's verdict was, practically speaking, more important and decisive.

ALTERNATIVES TO PAKISTAN

THE Lahore Resolution did not come to Hindu India as a bombshell. They were expecting it but had somehow or the other gained the impression that it was a stunt or a bargaining counter for winning more concessions and safeguards within the framework of a bi-national Indian Federation. When gradually they learnt that the Lahore Resolution was a very serious proposition and the Muslim masses were determined to attain complete separation and independence, efforts were made to suggest alternatives aimed at partly accommodating Muslim viewpoint and partly dodging it by maintaining the all India structure in the hope that ultimately the Pakistan Movement would lose tempo.

First of all Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, the leader of the untouchables, but hardly ever recognized as such by the Congress, entered the arena with a book named *Pakistan or the Partition of India.* After analysing the fundamental differences between the two nations he guessed that the Muslims alternative to Pakistan would be a truly bi-national Indian Federation based on fifty per cent representation in all central and provincial legislatures, in the central executive as well as in the civil service and the fighting forces and in all public bodies and commissions and on the condition that no change in the constitution and provincial boundaries and no action or treaty against any Muslim country would be operative without the approval of sixty-six per cent of the Muslim Legislators and that the national language had to be Urdu. Dr. Ambedkar considered that alternative, the figment of his own imagination, as "really a frightful and dangerous alternative". (pp. 188-195). Later he proposed his own formula in the form of an Act of Parliament, envisaging the establishment of Pakistan after a number of polls and comprising only the districts in which Muslims were

in majority. However, for ten years a Council of India based on equality of representation between Hindu India and Pakistan was to act as a sort of confederative body. It was provided that if after the expiry of that period, a majority of Muslim Legislators of Pakistan wanted separation, a fresh poll would be conducted and if that went in favour of separation, Pakistan would become an independent state (pp. 384-90).

Sir Ardeshir Dalal, an eminent Bombay industrialist, circulated privately "An Alternative to Pakistan" which was reviewed in the *Times of India* dated June 1, 1943. Mr. Durrani summarised it thus: "Sir Ardeshir Dalal prefers the Canadian model of a federal government at the centre charged with control only of "the essential minimum" of subjects including defence, foreign relations, currency, credit, customs and communications, and the residuary powers to vest in the provinces. He would have coalition ministries at the centre as well as in the provinces. One-third of the Ministers at the centre must be Muslims elected by their co-religionists in the legislature. Minority representation might exceed the fixed statutory minimum, but in no case the collective number of minority ministers exceed fifty per cent of the total number of the cabinet. In the federating units all minorities constituting more than a specified percentage of the population agreed to by mutual arrangement would be represented in the provincial cabinets in proportion to their population percentage." (p. 179). There was nothing new about it and, therefore, was treated with the contempt it deserved. Same was the fate of a formula presented by Malik Feroze Khan Noon in August 1942. He proposed the division of India into five "Dominions": (1) Bengal and Assam; (2) C.P., U.P. and Bihar; (3) Madras; (4) Bombay, and (5) the Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan and the N.W.F.P. These dominions were to have a federal central authority for the administration of defence, customs, foreign relations and currency. The authority was to consist of delegates nominated by the governments of the five dominions. It was provided that if at any time any dominion was dissatisfied with the working of the central authority, the dominion would have the power to secede. (Durrani, pp. 164-65).

C. R. Formula

Mr. C. Rajagopalacharia, popularly known as C.R. or Rajaji, was one of the big guns of the Congress who remained a member of the Congress Working Committee since 1921 and also served for some time as the Chief Minister of the Madras province, was the first Congress leader who realized that Pakistan shall have to be conceded in some form or the other. For that he had to resign not only from the membership of the Working Committee but also from the primary membership of the Congress. His formula was as follows:

(1) Subject to the terms set out below as regards the constitution for free India, the Muslim League endorses the Indian demand for independence and will co-operate with the Congress in the formation of a provisional interim government for the transitional period.

(2) After the termination of war, a Commission shall be appointed for demarcating contiguous districts in the North-West and East of India, wherein the Muslim population is in absolute majority. In the areas thus demarcated, a plebiscite of the inhabitants held on the basis of adult suffrage or other practicable franchise shall ultimately decide the issue of separation from Hindustan. If the majority decides in favour of forming a sovereign state separate from Hindustan, such decision shall be given effect to, without prejudice to the right of districts on the border to choose to join either state.

(3) It will be open to all parties to advocate their points of view before the plebiscite is held.

(4) In the event of separation, mutual agreements shall be entered into for safeguarding defence, commerce, communication and for other essential purposes.

(5) Any transfer of population shall only be on an absolutely voluntary basis.

(6) These terms shall be binding only in case of transfer by Britain of full power and responsibility for the governance of India.

Quaid-i-Azam called the proposal "A shadow and a husk, maimed, mutilated and moth-eaten Pakistan". This was because

firstly the division was to take place on district level; secondly, plebiscite was to be taken not only of Muslims but of all inhabitants creating the possibility of districts with just nominal Muslim majority opting for Hindustan: thirdly, the provision for border districts having the right of joining either of the two states was fraught with mischief, and, fourthly, the clause (4) implied the possibility of some sort of confederal arrangement. In spite of all these things Congress was not willing even to concede this formula.

Gandhi's Formula

It was after two years that Gandhi-Jinnah parleys began. In September 1944, fourteen meetings took place between the two leaders. During these parleys M.K. Gandhi presented the following proposals:

1. The areas should be demarcated by a Commission approved by the Congress and the League. The wishes of the inhabitants of the areas demarcated should be ascertained through the votes of the adult population of the areas or through some equivalent methods.
2. If the vote is in favour of separation it shall be agreed that these areas shall form a separate state as soon as possible, after India is free from foreign domination and can, therefore, be constituted into two sovereign independent states.
3. There shall be a treaty of separation which should also provide for the efficient and satisfactory administration of foreign affairs, defence, internal communications, customs, commerce and the like, which must necessarily continue to be matter of common interest between the contracting parties.
4. The treaty shall also contain terms for safeguarding the rights of minorities in the two states.
5. Immediately on the acceptance of this agreement by the Congress and the League, the two shall decide upon a common course of action for the attainment of independence of India.

6. The League will, however, be free to remain out of any direct action to which the Congress may resort and in which the League may not be willing to participate.

Gandhi's formula was worse than the C.R. Formula. It retained all the bad features of the latter and in addition, provided for the establishment of Pakistan "as soon as possible after India is free", which amounted to be a post-dated cheque liable to be cancelled by the giver. Secondly, while Gandhi did visualise the constitution of "two sovereign independent states" in clause (2), he intended to curb that independence by the imposition of a federal structure because the treaty of separation he envisaged was to "provide for the efficient and satisfactory administration of foreign affairs, defence, internal communications, customs, commerce and the like", which according to him "must necessarily continue to be matter of common interest between the two contracting parties".

Actually all these formulas and alternatives aimed at dodging the real issue. The underlying purpose was to make the Muslims agree to some sort of Indian federation or confederation or through truncating and maiming the Pakistan demanded by the Muslim League to such an extent that it would cease to be a worthwhile proposition. It was Quaid-i-Azam's sagacity and political wisdom that saved the Muslims from falling into the traps laid from time to time.

EMERGENCE OF PAKISTAN

THE Second World War assumed dangerous proportions. From April 1940 to June 1940 Nazi forces overran the entire Western Europe, brought France down to the knees and every moment there was the possibility of a direct invasion of Britain, for the aerial battle of Britain had already started. At that critical juncture in its history, Britain sought co-operation from the peoples inhabiting the subcontinent in the successful prosecution of the War. The Indian National Congress demanded a declaration of full independence and the setting up, as a transitory measure, of a provisional National Government representing all elected elements of the central legislature, as a price for co-operation. On the other hand, Muslim League demanded a declaration to the effect that the British Government would not adopt a constitution, temporary or final, without the previous approval of Muslim India and secondly, in any war-time re-organization "Muslim India must have an equal share in the authority and control of the Governments, central or provincial.

August Offer

Therefore, on August 8, 1940, the Indian Governor-General, Lord Linlithgow, declared his intention to expand his Executive Council and establish a body "which will more closely associate Indian public opinion with the conduct of war" and further said: "They (the British) could not contemplate transfer of their present responsibilities for the peace and welfare of India to any system of government whose authority is directly denied by large and powerful elements in India's national life. Nor could they be parties to the coercion of such elements into submission to such a Government." The same day the Secretary of State for India Mr. Amery declared in the House of Commons that "no constitutional change, interim or final, will be undertaken by the Parliament

unless there has been antecedent agreement, not only between the geographical units but also between the main social elements, both as to the manner of framing the constitution and the constitution itself." The Congress rejected the offer and launched a civil disobedience movement opposing participation in war effort, while the Muslim League expressed satisfaction with the assurance that no future constitution would be framed or enforced without its consent and approval. However, the Quaid-i-Azam declared that the League would not be a party to the setting up of any interim central government unless it was arranged on the basis of parity between the Hindus and the Muslims.

Cripps Proposals

The fortunes of War changed drastically. In December 1941, Japan entered the war and in the course of a few months overran the entire South-East Asia, captured Singapore, occupied Burma and adopted a threatening posture towards India by naval bombardment of its eastern coast. The United States of America, too, was in the war as Japan had made her the target of first devastating attack. Under U.S. pressure, the British Government made another effort to secure the co-operation of various political elements in India in the war effort. In March 1942, Sir Stafford Cripps was sent to India to hold fresh negotiations. Once a rebel Labour Party member, Sir Stafford Cripps became prominent during his appointment as the British Ambassador to Moscow in the dark phase of European history when Germany and Soviet Union had entered into a 20-year Non-Aggression Treaty. When Germany and Soviet Union were at war, he was called back home and made the Lord Privy Seal and Leader of the House of Commons. It was in that capacity and also because of his friendship with some Congress leaders that he was chosen for such an important assignment. Cripps brought the following proposals from the British Cabinet which were published the moment he set foot on the soil of India. The portions relevant to Pakistan are as follows:

(a) Immediately upon cessation of hostilities steps shall be taken to set up in India in manner described hereafter

an elected body charged with the task of framing a new constitution for India.

(b) Provision shall be made, as set out below, for participation of Indian States (the native states) in the constitution-making body.

(c) His Majesty's Government undertakes to accept and implement forthwith the constitution so framed subject only to:

(i) The right of any province of British India that is not prepared to accept the new constitution to retain its present constitutional position, provision being made for its subsequent accession if it so decides.

(ii) With such non-acceding provinces, should they so desire, His Majesty's Government will be prepared to agree upon a new constitution giving them the same full status as the Indian Union and arrived at by a procedure analogous to that here laid down."

In his broadcast to the peoples of India, Sir Stafford Cripps made the following observation: "Well, that is what we say to the provinces of India. Come together to frame a common constitution—if you find after all your discussion and all the give and take of a constitution-making assembly that you cannot overcome your differences and that some provinces are still not satisfied with the constitution, then such provinces can go out and remain out if they wish and just the same degree of self-government and freedom will be available for them, as for the Union itself, that is to say complete self-government."

In his press conference, Sir Stafford Cripps further elaborated the plan for accession or secession. He said: "If at the end of the Constituent Assembly proceedings, any province or provinces did not wish to accept the new constitution and join the Union, it was free to keep out—provided the Provincial Assembly of that province, by a substantial vote, say not less than sixty per cent. decided against accession. If it was less than sixty per cent., the minority could claim a plebiscite of the whole province for ascertaining the will of the people. In the case of the plebiscite, a bare

majority would be enough. Sir Stafford explained that for completing accession there would have to be a positive vote from the Provincial Assembly concerned. The non-acceding provinces could, if they wanted, combine into a separate Union through a separate Constituent Assembly, but in order to make such a Union practicable, they should be geographically contiguous."

This was a highly mischievous formula because, in the first instance, Muslims were expected to join in the deliberations of a Constituent Assembly aiming at the making of a constitution for a United India. Secondly, the right of non-accession was given to provinces as a whole as if the Muslim demand was for the right of self-determination for the provinces. Then a condition was laid that at least sixty per cent of the legislators in a province should vote for non-accession. This was virtually impossible as in Bengal Assembly, Muslim members were less than fifty per cent and in the Punjab Assembly they had a bare majority including those elected from special, non-communal constituencies. In the event of a less than sixty per cent majority, the minority was given the right to call for a plebiscite—not of Muslims alone but of all. What was the motive behind this provision? Probably the fact that Muslim Majority in Bengal was only 54 per cent and in Punjab only 56 per cent and the hope that Congress, with the assistance of its satellite Muslim parties, could muster up five and seven per cent of Muslim votes in order to kill Pakistan. Of course, a separate Union of non-acceding provinces was promised but on the condition that they had to be contiguous to each other, thereby excluding the possibility of Pakistan, comprising the provinces in the North-West and East of India. It was for these reasons that Muslim League rejected the proposal but Congress did likewise because the provinces were given the right to keep out of the Indian Union, and that was regarded as a blow to the concept of Indian unity.

Intermediary Developments

On August 8, 1942, the Congress Working Committee passed its "Quit India" Resolution that demanded immediate end of the British rule and sanctioned a mass struggle on the largest

possible scale. The British arrested the entire Working Committee by the morning of August 9 and also hundreds of prominent leaders throughout the subcontinent. That resulted in a highly violent movement bringing in its wake a very large number of sabotage cases. However, the revolt was quelled. There remained a stalemate, but soon after the War events moved at a terrific pace. The army was on the verge of revolt and the Navy in Bombay had shown which way the wind blew. There were political parleys, deadlocks, British and Congress insistence on maintaining the unity of India, Muslim insistence on Pakistan, general elections and a trail of Hindu-Muslim riots on an unprecedented scale. Lord Wavell, the new Viceroy and Governor-General called Simla Conference attended by twenty-two leaders. He told them that while the offer of Cripps Proposals was open, he wanted immediate setting up of a representative government at the centre as a short-term measure with a parity between Muslims and the caste Hindus. The Congress wanted to have two Muslims as its nominees to which Muslim League objected as it claimed to be the only authoritative and representative body of the Muslims. There occurred a deadlock and the Simla Conference came to naught.

General elections were held. Muslim League fought the elections on the issue of Pakistan and captured 425 out of 441 Muslim seats of provincial assemblies. That confirmed once for all that the League alone could represent the Muslims. Congress offered a big provocation to Muslims in the Punjab. Muslim League was the largest single party in the Assembly and represented almost ninety per cent of Muslim legislators. However, the Congress Party, by-passing the League, entered into a coalition with Malik Khizar Hayat Khan Tiwana and a few of his colleagues. In Sind and Bengal, there were League cabinets while in the N.W.F.P. the Congress retained power.

Cabinet Mission

The British Government sent in March 1946, three Cabinet Ministers, namely Lord Pethic Lawrence, Secretary of State for India, Sir Stafford Cripps, President of the Board of Trade and

Mr. A.V. Alexander, First Lord of the Admiralty, for negotiations with Indian leaders. The negotiations and discussions continued for seven weeks but with no tangible result. Thereupon the Cabinet Mission gave its own formula in the course of a lengthy statement. Discussing the Pakistan issue it presented the following points:

1. The communal percentage in Pakistan envisaged by the Muslim League would be as follows:

	Muslims	*Non-Muslims*
North-Western Area	62.07%	37.93%
North-Eastern Area	51.69%	48.31%

The figures show that it would not solve the communal minority problem.

2. Every argument that can be used in favour of Pakistan can equally, in our view, be used in favour of the exclusion of the non-Muslim areas from Pakistan.

3. A smaller sovereign Pakistan confined to the Muslim majority areas alone.... is regarded by the Muslim League as quite impracticable because it would entail the exclusion from Pakistan of (a) the whole of the Ambala and Jullundhar Divisions in the Punjab; (b) the whole of Assam except the district of Sylhet; (c) a large part of Western Bengal including Calcutta....

4. The whole of the transportation and postal and telegraph systems of India have been established on the basis of a united India. To disintegrate them would gravely injure both parts of India. The case for a united defence is even stronger.... The two sections of the suggested Pakistan contain the two most vulnerable frontiers of India and for a successful defence in depth of the area of Pakistan would be insufficient.

5. Finally there is the geographical fact that the two halves of the proposed Pakistan State are separated by some seven hundred miles and the communications between them both in war and peace would be dependent on the goodwill of Hindustan.

6. We are, therefore unable to advise the British Government that the power.... should be handed over to two entirely separate sovereign States.

Then the Mission discussed the Muslim apprehensions and the solutions offered by the Congress and expressed the opinion that such a scheme would present considerable constitutional disadvantages and anomalies and after that presented its own formula as given in brief below:

1. There will be a three-tier Federation with the following component parts: (A) Provinces; (B) Three groups of provinces; (C) All-India Union.

2. The All-India Union to control Defence, Communications and Foreign Affairs only.

3. Each province to have autonomy more or less on the same basis as under the Government of India Act, 1935.

4. Three groups of provinces to be made in the following manner: (A) Six Hindu majority provinces; (B) Punjab, Sind, N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan; (C) Bengal and Assam.

The Group governments to have powers formerly vesting in the Centre with the exception of Defence, Communications and Foreign Affairs.

5. After ten years, any province or group of provinces could re-consider her association with the All India Union.

6. The actual distribution of powers between the authorities of the three tiers to be determined by a Constituent Assembly to be elected by the Electoral College comprising members of the provincial assemblies according to proportional representation.

7. First the whole Constituent Assembly shall meet. After that it will meet in 3 groups separately.

8. The second part of the Mission Plan related to the setting up of a representative government at the Centre to tide over the period of transition.

9. The whole plan was to be accepted or rejected *in toto.*

Party Position

The Muslim League accepted the plan *in toto* and expressed its willingness to enter the Central Government. She hoped to

convert the two groups of Muslim provinces into an independent state within a decade by invoking the enabling provision of the scheme. The Congress accepted the plan but refused to enter the government. It announced its intention to turn the Constituent Assembly into a sovereign body competent to sweep away the appointed limits to its authority and begin by striking out the grouping plan.

How the Cabinet Mission Plan came to an end, is an interesting story. After acceptance of the Plan, Pandit Nehru issued statements after statements virtually repudiating all Congress commitments. On July 7, 1946 he said: "We are not bound by a single thing except that we have decided for the moment to go into the Constituent Assembly." On July 10, he said: "What we do there, we are entirely and absolutely free to determine. We have committed ourselves on no single matter to any body." Maulana Azad said that the Constituent Assembly would have "unfettered right to make a constitution and it would be sovereign and would legislate for a united, not divided India".

Such irresponsible utterances convinced the League that Congress did not mean proper business. Quaid-i-Azam declared that the Congress leaders' interpretation of the role of the Constituent Assembly was a complete repudiation of the long-term scheme of the Cabinet Mission. On July 27, 1946, the League Council reversed its acceptance of the Plan and decided to take direct action for the achievement of Pakistan. August 16 was declared to be the *Direct Action Day* on which an India-wide general *hartal* was to be observed. Quaid-i-Azam said: "Today we bid good-bye to constitutional methods. Today we have also forged a pistol and are in a position to use it."

Muslim League wanted to observe the Direct Action Day peacefully but the militant Hindu forces came forward to disrupt it. The result was the "Great Calcutta Killing" resulting in 4,700 deaths, injury to 15,000 and 150,000 refugees fleeing the city. Rioting spread all over the subcontinent; in East Bengal, Bihar and Punjab. The total loss of life from August, 1946 to February 1947 was 12,000.

Meanwhile Congress entered the Interim Government, followed by the League after some time, but the principle of collective responsibility could not be observed. The result was utter chaos.

In the Punjab and N.W.F.P., the Muslim League launched a Mass Civil Disobedience Movement for the repeal of Public Safety Act. Thereupon Malik Khizr Hayat Khan Tiwana resigned the Premiership resulting in the ouster of the Congress from power. That infuriated the Hindus and the Sikhs and set the ball rolling in the direction of still bigger riots.

June 3 Plan

As things deteriorated rapidly, Mr. Clement Attlee, the British Prime Minister, on February 20, 1947 dismissed Lord Wavell, appointed Lord Mountbatten as Viceroy and gave him the directive to make a last bid for securing the consent of both parties to the Cabinet Mission Plan, falling back on Partition as the last resort. Mr. Attlee further fixed June 1948 as the date of British withdrawal from India, even if the Hindus and Muslims failed to come to an agreement over the future. Mountbatten took over on March 22, 1947 and started immediate parleys with the leaders.

After a number of conferences with the leaders, Mountbatten went to London, consulted the British Government on an alternative plan, came back on June 2, immediately met the leaders and on June 3 announced the new plan in a broadcast to the country in which he expressed his great regret that no plan for preserving the political unity of India was acceptable and said there would be no coercion. The solution to the dilemma was the transfer of British power to two governments, each having dominion status, the charge-over to be made within the next few months.

The main features of the June 3 Plan or the Mountbatten Plan as it was called by many, were as follows:

1. The Punjab and Bengal to be partitioned if the representatives of their minority districts so desired.
2. Referendum in N.W.F.P. and in the Muslim district of Sylhet in Assam, so that the people could express their preference for amalgamation with either state.

3. The Sind Legislature to indicate its willingness or otherwise to join the new State.
4. Similar decision to be made by the Assembly of Elders in Baluchistan.
5. If the result of above is Partition, there were to be two Constituent Assemblies instead of one.
6. The Boundary Commission to demarcate the boundaries between the two States "on the basis of contiguous majority areas of Muslims and non-Muslims," and "other factors".
7. Expert bodies to effect a distribution of the assets and liabilities of the Central Government between India and Pakistan.

The Mountbatten Plan was implemented in sheer haste. The representatives of the minority districts in the Punjab and Bengal decided to join India. The Sylhet referendum resulted in a resounding victory for Pakistan. The referendum in N.W.F.P. posed an initial problem. The Congress Party in power in that province wanted to include "independence" as the third alternative in referendum. That was when Pakhtunistan was named for the first time. That plea was not accepted and as a result Congress Party boycotted the referendum. However, a majority of total number of voters exercised their votes and supported Pakistan. A similar decision was given by the Sind Legislature and the Assembly of Elders in Baluchistan. That the British reaction to Pakistan was positively hostile is evident from the following facts:

—Britain did her best to keep India one.

—Mountbatten was asked to do his best to maintain Indian unity.

—Mr. Attlee, the British Prime Minister, speaking during the second reading of the Indian Independence Bill in the Parliament, said: "This severance may not endure and the two dominions which we now propose to set up, may, in course of time, come together again."

The British hostility rose in tempo when Quaid-i-Azam refused to propose Mountbatten to the Governor-Generalship of Pakistan

in addition to the Governor-Generalship of India which had already been offered to him. Quaid-i-Azam proposed his own name for the office as he was suspicious of Mountbatten's intentions.

How strong was the reaction of Mountbatten can be guaged from his own account (quoted by Hodson in "The Great Divide" from Viceroy's Personal Report No. 11, July 4, 1947) which is as follows:

"Jinnah solemnly assured me that he realised all the disadvantages of giving up the common Governor-General, that his one ambition was that I should stay on as Viceroy, or overall Governor-General, to see the partition through, but he was unable to accept any position other than that of Governor-General of Pakistan on 15th August.

"I asked him: 'Do you realise what this will cost you?' He said sadly: 'It may cost me several crores of rupees in assets', to which I replied somewhat acidly: 'It may well cost you the whole of your assets and the future of Pakistan.' I then got up and left the room." (p. 331).

The British hostility took a further ugly turn when Sir Cyril Radcliffe, Chairman of the Boundary Commission gave a political award. "It detached sizeable contiguous majority areas (the larger part of the district of Gurdaspur and the Tahsils of Zira and Fazilka) of Muslims that rightfully belonged to West Pakistan and gifted them to India to give rise to a crop of strategic, political and frontier problems." The Kashmir problem owes its origin to Radcliffe Award, for Pathankot was given to India and through that it had access to the Jammu and Kashmir State.

QUAID-I-AZAM AND PAKISTAN

THE Quaid-i-Azam was not always the Quaid-i-Azam. Nor was he always the darling of Muslim masses. He started his political career as a member of the Indian National Congress and as a disciple of Gokhale, a leader imbued with liberalism. He joined the Muslim League in 1913 and that too with the purpose of bringing the League and the Congress close to each other with a view to forging a united Hindu-Muslim front, so that self-government could be secured from the British. The Lucknow Pact, first and the last agreement between the two nations, was the outcome of his sustained efforts. That was why he was called the Ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity. He participated in the Home Rule Movement under the leadership of Mrs. Annie Besant, worked against Rowlatt Act and as a protest resigned the membership of the Imperial Legislative Council and played a great role in the creation of that political consciousness which ultimately led to the Non-Cooperation Movement. He remained out of it only because he was a conscientious objector to the breaking of laws and indulging in unconstitutional practices.

The Hindu-Muslim honeymoon came to an abrupt end after the Non-Cooperation Movement. Hindu chauvinism gained such a momentum that Lucknow Pact became a dead letter. The Ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity again entered the arena and devoted all energy and effort in the direction of bringing about a fresh understanding between the two organizations. But he failed miserably, because Congress was so much under the Hindu chauvinist pressure that it aimed at a virtual Hindu *Raj*. As Jinnah could not play the second fiddle to the Congress, the Ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity became a *persona non grata* with it. And when he came out with the famous "Jinnah's Fourteen Points", he was declared an arch-communalist.

Jinnah's Fourteen Points envisaged a bi-national Indian federation with the Muslim Nation as a junior partner expected to be satisfied with a number of safeguards. But even that position was not acceptable to the Congress whose representatives in the Round Table Conferences held in London stood as a rock against Muslim demands. It is an irony of fate that it was the British Communal Award that conceded some of the points and incorporated those in the Government of India Act of 1935.

When Jinnah re-emerged on the political scene in 1936, he was the leader of the Muslim League, a political party with very limited influence. The common man was enamoured of *Khudai Khidmatgars* in the N.W.F.P., *Ahrars* and *Khaksars* in the Punjab and *Krishak Proja Party* of Maulvi A. K. Fazlul Haq in Bengal, and most of the Muslim elites in Punjab were under the grip of the Unionist Party and in the United Provinces were wedded to the National Agricultural Party of the Nawab of Chattari. So far as the Muslim League was concerned, it had some substantial support in Bengal, some in Muslim minority provinces but it generally consisted of Muslim landlords with a sprinkling of middle class lawyers of small influence. The Muslim press was weak—with one slice belonging to nationalist school of thought and the other owing allegiance to Muslim separatism. There was only one Muslim English-language daily in the whole of the subcontinent, namely, *Star of India*, Calcutta, and that too had a limited circulation. And the news agencies were Hindu-dominated and Hindu-managed. Undaunted by these heavy odds Jinnah manoeuvred things in such a manner that the Congress, a mass organization with wide dimensions and possessed of a very strong press was outwitted, and by October 1937, the Chief Ministers of the Punjab, Bengal and Assam, alongwith their supporters, rallied round the Muslim League, and the subsequent developments brought the common man so near the League that in almost all by-elections the League candidates came out with flying colours. M. A. Jinnah became the Quaid-i-Azam in the real sense of the term.

The Congress leaders did not see the writing on the wall. Instead of coming to an understanding with the Muslims, the

Congress initiated a Muslim Mass Contact Movement with the objective of ignoring and by-passing the Muslim League and weaning away the Muslim masses from the League leadership. Money lavishly spent on non-entities who were ready to play the game but the whole scheme fizzled out. The Hindus could impress Muslims if they had acted democratically and with the spirit of justice and fairplay in the Congress-governed provinces. But power-intoxicated as they were, the Congress ministries did all in their power to crush the Muslims, and the Quaid-i-Azam had to say at the Patna session of the League held in December 1938: "It is a misfortune of our country; indeed, it is a tragedy that the High Command of the Congress is determined, absolutely determined to crush all other communities and cultures in this country and establish Hindu *Raj*. They talk of *Swaraj* but they mean only Hindu Government." (*Foundations*, vol. II, p. 305). That was not an emotional outburst, but the well-considered conclusion of a politician of eminence who had passed through the mill of Indian nationalism and had seen the Congress from close quarters both from within and outside.

There was nothing new in the Quaid-i-Azam's belief in the two-nation reality. His support to the principle of separate electorates for Muslims and his Fourteen Points bore ample testimony to that. However, his belief in the viability of a bi-national Indian federation based on peaceful co-existence was badly shaken in the late thirties. Iqbal's letters sent in 1936-37 had also influenced his views, as noted earlier. That Iqbal's views were substantially in consonance with those of the Quaid-i-Azam, is also borne out by the fact that it was under the chairmanship of the Quaid that the October 1938 session of the Sind Provincial Muslim League passed a resolution demanding the establishment of two federations—Federation of Muslim States and the Federation of non-Muslim States.

However, it is his presidential address at the Lahore Session in March, 1940, that provides a comprehensive picture of his thesis for Pakistan. He said:

> "The problem in India is not of an intercommunal but manifestly of an international character and it must be treated

as such. So long as this basic and fundamental truth is not realised, any constitution that may be built will result in disaster and will prove destructive and harmful not only to the Musalmans, but also to the British and Hindus. If the British Government are really earnest and sincere to secure peace and happiness of the people of this sub-continent, the only course open to us all is to allow the major nations separate homelands by dividing India into 'autonomous national states'. There is no reason why these States should be antagonistic to each other. On the other hand, the rivalry and the natural desire and efforts on the part of the one to dominate the social order and establish political supremacy over the other in the government of the country, will disappear. It will lead more towards natural good-will by international pacts between them, and they can live in complete harmony with their neighbours. This will lead further to a friendly settlement all the more easily with regard to minorities by reciprocal arrangements and adjustments between the Muslim India and the Hindu India, which will far more adequately and effectively safeguard the rights and interests of Muslims and various other minorities.

"It is extremely difficult to appreciate why our Hindu friends fail to understand the real nature of Islam and Hinduism. They are not religions in the strict sense of the word, but are, in fact, different and distinct social orders and it is a dream that the Hindus and Muslims can ever evolve a common nationality, and this misconception of one Indian nation has gone far beyond the limits and is the cause of most of our troubles and will lead India to destruction if we fail to revise our notions in time. The Hindus and the Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs, and literature. They neither inter-marry, nor inter-dine together and indeed they belong to two different civilizations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their aspects on life and of life are different. It is quite clear that Hindus and Mussalmans derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different epics, their heroes are different, and

they have different episodes. Very often the hero of one is a foe of the other and likewise their victories and defeats overlap. To yoke together two such nations under a single state, one as a numercial minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be so built up for the government of such a state.

"History has presented to us many examples such as the Union of Great Britain and Ireland, of Czechoslovakia and Poland. History has also shown to us many geographical tracts, much smaller than the subcontinent of India, which otherwise might have been called one country but which have been divided into as many states as there are nations inhabiting them. Balkan Peninsula comprises as many as seven or eight sovereign states. Likewise, the Portuguese and the Spanish stand divided in the Berian Peninsula. Whereas under the plea of unity of India and one nation, which does not exist it is sought to pursue here the line of one Central Government, when we know that the history of the last 12 hundred years has failed to achieve unity and has witnessed during the ages India always divided into Hindu India and Muslim India. The present artificial unity of India dates back only to the British conquest and is maintained by the British bayonet, but the termination of the British regime, which is implicit in the recent declaration of His Majesty's Government, will be the herald of the entire break-up with worse disaster than has ever taken place during the last one thousand years under the Muslims. Surely that is not the legacy which Britain would bequeath to India after 150 years of her rule, nor would the Hindu and Muslim India risk such a sure catastrophe.

"Muslim India cannot accept any constitution which must necessarily result in a Hindu-majority government. Hindus and Muslims brought together under a democratic system forced upon the minorities can only mean Hindu *Raj*. Democracy of the kind with which the Congress High Command is enamoured, would mean the complete destruction of what is most precious in Islam. We have had ample experience of the working of the provincial constitutions during the last two and a half years and any repetition

of such a government must lead to civil war and raising of private armies as recommended by Mr. Gandhi to Hindus of Sukkur when he said that they must defend themselves violently or non-violently, blow for blow, and if they could not they must emigrate.

"Mussalmans are not a minority as it is commonly known and understood. One has only got to look round. Even today, according to the British map of India, 4 out of 11 provinces, where the Muslims dominate more or less, are functioning notwithstanding the decision of the Hindu Congress High Command to non-co-operate and prepare for civil disobedience. Mussalmans are a nation according to any definition of a nation and they must have their homelands, their territory and their State. We wish to live in peace and harmony with our neighbours as a free and independent people. We wish our people to develop to the fullest our spiritual, cultural, economic, social and political life in a way that we think best and in consonance with our own ideals and according to the genius of our people."

These views represent in a nutshell the accumulated thinking of Muslim intellectuals, educationists and politicians during the preceding three-quarters of a century. The two-nation reality was apparent from the very beginning, right from Al-Biruni's days. The modern Hindu historian Majumdar confirms that even at the beginning of nineteenth century "the Hindus and Muslims were regarded both by the British and the Indians as two separate communities with distinct cultures, and different physical, moral and mental characteristics". This reality was first brought to the forefront by the Hindus. The veteran Indian Muslim nationalist leader, Dr. Syed Mahmud, bears testimony to that, for he writes in his book *Hindu-Muslim Cultural Accord* as follows:

"The Hindus were the first to come under the sway of revivalism . . . . they began to entertain the belief that they could do so in isolation from and at the expense of other Indian communities. (p. 55). During the span of half-a-century Hindu intellectuals, writers and politicians continued harping on the theme that there existed only one nation—the Hindu Nation, that in order to bring

about the national homogeneity, Muslims shall have to be converted to Hinduism. The two-nation reality was also very apparent to the Muslims. Sir Syed Ahmad believed in it and spoke of the differences in nationality, religion, ways of living, customs, mores, culture and historical traditions."

Many other Muslim leaders expressed similar views. Iqbal gave it a philosophic tinge; and the fundamental differences between the Hindus and Muslims as enunciated by the Quaid-i-Azam bear a very striking resemblance to the analysis made by Chaudhry Rahmat Ali in 1933 in his pamphlet *Now or Never*. The resemblance is not only of the thought but also of the words.

When the Quaid-i-Azam said that "the problem in India is not of an inter-communal but manifestly of an international character", he echoed the thoughts of Sir Syed, Maulana Mohammad Ali and Iqbal.

The logical conclusion of the two-nation reality was the establishment of a separate Muslim State or States and it is interesting to note that even a Hindu leader of eminence, Lala Lajpat Rai, arrived at the same conclusion and drew a map of Pakistan which became a reality after twenty-two years. Though Hindu chauvinist movements had embittered the Hindu-Muslim relations to an extent that there followed a civil war without armies, yet whenever a Muslim leader pleaded for the partition of the subcontinent, the underlying idea behind that was not confrontation but a peaceful co-existence. Iqbal said: "If an effective principle of co-operation is discovered in India, it will bring peace and mutual goodwill to this ancient land which has suffered so long, more because of her situation in historic space than because of any inherent incapacity of her people. And it will at the same time solve the entire political problem of Asia." In the same Address (at Allahabad), he said: "I, therefore, demand the formation of a consolidated Muslim state in the best interests of India and Islam. For India it means security and peace resulting from an internal balance of power, for Islam an opportunity to rid itself of the stamp that Arabian Imperialism was forced to give it, to mobilise its law, its education, its culture, and to bring them into

closer contact with its own original spirit and with the spirit of modern times." The Quaid-i-Azam was more specific about the same for he said that there was no reason why these states should be antagonistic to each other. He further said: "On the other hand. the rivalry and the natural desire and efforts, on the part of the one to dominate the social order and establish political supremacy over the other in the government of the country will disappear. It will lead more towards natural goodwill by international pacts between them, and they can live in complete harmony with their neighbours."

That leads us to a discussion of the Pakistan Ideology which is nothing but the Islamic ideology. Both Iqbal and the Quaid-i-Azam have talked of the social order of Islam. Iqbal said: "The religious ideal of Islam, therefore, is organically related to the social order which it has created. The rejection of the one will eventually involve the rejection of the other. Therefore, the construction of a polity on national lines, if it means the displacement of the Islamic principles of solidarity, is simply unthinkable to a Muslim." And the Quaid-i-Azam declared: "We wish our people to develop to the fullest our spiritual, cultural, economic, social and political life in a way that we think best and in consonance with our own ideals and according to the genius of our people." And what is the ideal? The Quaid stated that in scores of his speeches and statements but the following quotation from his Eid message in 1945 covers all points:

"Everyone, except those who are ignorant, knows that the Quran is the general code of Muslims. A religious, social, civil, commercial, military, judicial, criminal, penal code; it regulates everything from the ceremonies of religion to those of daily life, from the salvation of the soul to the health of the body; from the rights of all to those of each individual, from morality to crime, for punishment here to that in the life to come; and our Prophet has enjoined on us that every Mussulman should possess a copy of the Quran and be his own priest. Therefore, Islam is not merely confined to the spiritual tenets or doctrines or rituals and ceremonies.

It is a complete code regulating the whole Muslim society, every department of life, collective and individual."

When the Quaid-i-Azam gave his presidential address to the Pakistan Constituent Assembly on August 11, 1947, he made important policy pronouncements with regard to the status of minorities in Pakistan. He said: "You are free: you are free to go to your temples, you are free to go to your mosques, or to any other places of worship in this state of Pakistan. You may belong to any religion, or caste or creed—that has nothing to do with the business of the state. . . . We are starting in the days when there is no discrimination, no distinction between one community or the other, no distinction between one caste or creed and another. We are starting with this fundamental principle that we are all citizens and equal citizens of one state. . . . Now, I think we should keep that in front of us as our ideal and you will find that in course of time Hindus would cease to be Hindus and Muslims would cease to be Muslims, not in the religious sense, for that is the personal faith of each individual, but in the political sense as citizens of the state". (Speeches, Jamiluddin, pp. 403-4).

Mr. Justice S. A. Rahman, author of *Punishment of Apostasy in Islam* has given a cogent interpretation of this statement in the following words: "One must not be misled by the use of expression 'cease to be', in this passage. This was only a rhetorical method of emphasizing the fact that all residents of Pakistan would henceforth share a common citizenship, equally. The words 'not in the religious sense' should be prominently kept in view, while considering its implications. He seems to have been anxious to assure the minorities of Pakistan that they would enjoy full cultural and religious autonomy along with fundamental equality as citizens. As I have pointed out elsewhere, these non-Muslims were neither *dhimmies* nor *mustamins*, in the technical sense of Islamic jurisprudence. They are rather in the position of *Muahids, i.e.*, people who had a pact with the Muslims. I have also cited there the august historical precedent set by the Prophet (peace be upon him) by his pact with the Jewish and Christian tribes of Medina, soon after he had migrated to that holy city. This pact equated

them with the Muslims for certain stated purposes, subject to the contracting parties retaining full liberty of conscience and autonomy in the religious field, with the reservation that the Prophet would be the Head of the State as the acknowledged leader of the predominant Muslim community. Here also we are bound to honour the solemn agreement entered into by the high contracting parties to the Partition of India, that the minorities in each dominion would have equal rights and equal protection of the law. These factors appear to have been present in the mind of the Quaid-i-Azam when he made the above pronouncement. As would be clear from the sequel, the Quaid never abandoned his ideal of state under which the Muslim community could order their lives in accordance with the dictates of the Quran and the Sunnah."

The idea of Pakistan had existed for long. Iqbal and Rahmat Ali worked for it, one as philosopher, the other as a lone worker very far from the scene. But it was the Quaid-i-Azam, who very laboriously prepared the ground, galvanised an economically poor and an educationally backward nation against heavy odds, fought gallantly against the combined machinations of the Congress and British colonialism, who attached sanctity to the myth of Indian unity, and ultimately came out victorious in establishing Pakistan, then the largest Muslim sovereign state in the world. No doubt, he was the founder and the maker of Pakistan, and the Father of the Nation.

PAKISTAN MOVEMENT IN ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVE

WHAT was the motive behind the Pakistan Movement—religious, cultural or economic? That question has often been raised or discussed in a spirit of partisanship by our intellectuals, but it was hardly ever realised that the motive could simultaneously be religious, cultural and economic. Islam, as a way of life in its entirety, aims at the spiritual as well as material well-being of the mankind and that embraces in its fold the cultural and economic uplift of the masses. Therefore, even if it is assumed for a moment that the motive was exclusively religious and cultural, that does not exclude the need for the establishment of an equitable socio-economic order eliminating exploitation of man by man, as set out in the Quran and Sunnah. However, it is a historical fact that economic motive specifically held ground throughout the struggle for the attainment of Pakistan.

Iqbal, the master-mind behind the Muslim demand for the right of self-determination, placed emphasis on the political and cultural aspects in his Allahabad Address, but in the course of his letter dated 28th May 1937 to the Quaid-i-Azam, he dilated upon the economic issues. He said: "The question, therefore, is: how is it possible to solve the problem of Muslim poverty? . . . . If the League can give no such promises, I am sure the Muslim masses will remain indifferent to it as before. Happily there is a solution in the enforcement of the law of Islam and its further development in the light of modern ideas. After a careful study of Islamic Law I have come to the conclusion that if this system of law is properly understood and applied, at least the right to subsistence will be secured to everybody. But the enforcement and development of the Shariah of Islam is impossible in this

country without a free Muslim state or states. This has been my honest conviction for many years and I still believe this to be the only way to solve the problem of bread for Muslims as well as to secure a peaceful India."

Then, in the same letter, he dilated upon the social democracy and said: ". . . . if Hinduism accepts social democracy, it must necessarily cease to be Hinduism. For Islam the acceptance of social democracy in some suitable form and consistent with the legal principles of Islam is not a revolution but a return to the original purity of Islam." Iqbal's desire for the acceptance of social democracy and "for the further development in the light of modern ideas" of the law of Islam assumes all the more importance if we scan through the pages of his book, *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*. He agreed with the Turkish *Ijtihad* that according to the spirit of Islam, the Caliphate or Imamate could be vested in an elected assembly and also expressed the opinion that the power of *Ijtihad* be transferred from individual representatives of schools to a Muslim Legislative Assembly "which, in view of the growth of opposing sects, is the only possible form *Ijma* can take in modern times". Not only that, Iqbal said in the Foreword to the same book: "It must, however, be remembered that there is no such thing as finality in philosophical thinking. As knowledge advances and fresh avenues of thought are opened, other views, and probably sounder views than those set forth in these lectures, are possible. Our duty is carefully to watch the progress of human thought and to maintain an independent critical attitude towards it." Thus a blind negation of all so-called "alien ideologies" goes totally against the spirit of inquiry suggested by Iqbal.

The Quaid-i-Azam was inspired by the ideas of Iqbal. In the course of his presidential address to the All-India Muslim League at Delhi, April 1943, he said: "Here I should like to give a warning to the landlords and capitalists who have flourished at our expense by a system which is so vicious, which is so wicked and which makes them so selfish, that it is difficult to reason with them. The exploitation of the masses has gone into their blood. They have

forgotten the lesson of Islam. Greed and selfishness have made these people subordinate the interests of others in order to fatten themselves. It is true, we are not in power today. You go anywhere to the countryside. I visited some villages. There are millions and millions of our people, who hardly get one meal a day. Is this civilization? Is this the aim of Pakistan? (cries of 'No', 'No'). Do you visualize that millions have been exploited and cannot get one meal a day. If that is the idea of Pakistan, I would not have it. If they are wise, they will have to adjust themselves to the new modern conditions of life. If they don't, God help them: we should not help them."

With the blessings and support of the Quaid-i-Azam, a resolution moved by Mr. Z. H. Lari was passed at the thirty-first session of the League, held at Karachi, that authorised the President "to appoint a committee with powers to prepare a comprehensive scheme for a five-year programme for economic and social uplift: State industrialization in the Pakistan zones: the introduction of free primary basic education: reform of the land system: stabilization of the rent: security of tenure: improvement in the condition of labour and agriculture: and control of money-lending".

The discussion on the resolution gives us an insight into the thinking pattern of the League leaders. Mr. Z. H. Lari said that state industries were to be established so that the labourers got a fair deal; the big landlords were the creation of the British and the League did not desire to back them and that the proposed committee would work out plans on how a tiller of the soil might get the best of his rights. Mr. Tamizuddin said: "The essential industries should be run by the State and there should be complete industrialization of the country. We shall not be able to create conditions under which the State can own all the essential industries unless we are able to get our independence. Money can come from the same source from which it came in Soviet Russia." Mr. Hamid Nizami said: "Mussalmans are a nation of poor people. We must, therefore, first attend to the demands of our poor people, we have to think of their needs, we have no time now for attending to the

rich landlords. Let us open all doors of the All-India Muslim League, so that poor people and the proletariat can enter it and realise that joining the League is the one and only panacea of their needs." The Quaid-i-Azam commended the resolution and it was passed unanimously amidst loud cheers, and none raised his finger against the connotation of the terms, "State industrialization", "the proletariat" and the money coming "from the same source from which it came in Soviet Russia".

On November 8, 1945, the Quaid-i-Azam told a representative of the Associated Press of America: "You are asking me to interpret what the Government will do. But personally I believe that in these modern days essential key industries ought to be controlled and managed by the State. That applies also to certain public utilities. But what is a key industry and what is a utility service are matters for the law-makers to say, not for me".

Again, when the Quaid-i-Azam met the League workers at Calcutta on March 1, 1946, he made an emphatic assertion that the League stood for the poor and the down-trodden and not for the rich. When asked about the position of the poor in the Pakistan State, he said that he had no sympathy for the capitalists. He added: "I am an old man. God has given me enough to live comfortably at this age. Why would I turn my blood into water, run about and take so much trouble. Not for the capitalists surely, but for you, the poor people .... I feel it and, in Pakistan, we will do all in our power to see that everybody can get a decent living."

The manifestoes published by the provincial Leagues of the Punjab and Bengal in 1944 and 1945, respectively, contained a Socialist programme. The Punjab manifesto "declared that there should be nationalization of key industries and banks, beginning with immediate nationalization of all public utility services, public control of private industry, a ceiling placed on land holdings and an equalization of the burden of taxation involving the imposition of additional taxes on large landowners." (Khalid bin Sayeed, p. 425). According to Smith "it reads almost like a Communist document" and adds: "The Bengal Muslim League's draft Manifesto published immediately after the Bengal ministry was overthrown,

was still more radical, looked forward still more clearly to a people's rule". (pp. 22-23).

The contemporary literature on Pakistan published in mid-forties is another source material through which the nature of the economic motives could be ascertained. Iqbal's old associate and the veteran journalist, Mr. F. K. Khan Durrani, wrote in his book *The Meaning of Pakistan* as follows: "The idea of Pakistan has put the Muslim imagination afire. They see strange, undreamed of, limitless possibilities in it. . . . They imagine Pakistan to be a State in which men would be free from oppression, injustice and exploitation, and free from selfish greeds, covetousness and fear of poverty. It will be a State in which men, instead of fattening on the labour of others, will take pride and find joy in working for the happiness and well-being of others; in which wealth and birth will have no privileges and poverty no handicap: in which the son of the humblest and poorest man will have all the opportunities of education and advancement that his talents entitle him to; in which poverty, ignorance and filth shall stand abolished; in which no man shall go to bed hungry, though it may not have many millionaires; and in which, being an Islamic state, there will be no distinction of Muslims and non-Muslims among its citizens in the matter of civic rights and economic benefits." (pp. 158-59).

Dr. G. M. D. Sufi in his book *Common Sense on Pakistan*, dilating upon the nature of Government in Pakistan, said: "Wider education in all possible spheres, healthier living, basic living wage to workers, provision for insurance, old age pensions and progress of the country as a whole, should be the mottos for its administration." (p. 21).

Khan Iftikhar Husain Khan of Mamdot, the well-known Punjab League leader, in the course of the Foreword to Iftikhar-ul-Haq's book *Pakistan and Constituent Assembly*, writes: "By far the most formidable and unequal struggle against which the Muslims have to contend, with disastrous result to themselves, is that of the Hindu-Muslim economic front, with the monopoly

of external and internal trade, banking and insurance as the Hindu citadel and the enterprising company promoter and ubiquitous *bania* as its most stalwart protagonists. Profiting by the British-made laws, coupled with the time-honoured usage of 'buy Hindu', the Muslims have been beaten hip and thigh out of the economic arena by the Hindus. Today, the feeling prevails that the Muslims have not the remotest chance of retrieving their shattered condition through a system which is capitalistic to the core, except under a system—a veritable Pakistan—based on an equitable legislation for acquisition and distribution of wealth". (p. v).

The socio-economic motives behind the Pakistan Movement were discussed at length by Mr. Z. A. Suleri in his book *Road to Peace and Pakistan*. According to him one of the three reasons contributing to the formulation of the demand for Pakistan was: "Muslim impact with Western thoughts has given birth to a strong sense of realization that mankind needs Islam which can also solve its economic and social problems and give it spiritual satisfaction of mind. And the only way that mankind can be shown the way to Islam is to reduce its principles to the actuality of operation. This they hope to realise in Pakistan" (p. 52). He says that Islam aims at revolutionizing the mind of man and gives him a direction. "This direction pertains to all aspects of his life, economic, spiritual, moral and social and establishes correlation between them.... it is this revolution of mind which Islam primarily counts on bringing about a voluntary, natural, all the same revolutionary, classlessness of society." (p. 62).

Comparing Islam and Socialism, Mr. Suleri observes: "Summarising our comparative study of Socialism and Islam, as it may be said that Islam is in agreement with Socialism insofar as it aims at securing men a life free from material cares and to that and Islam outlines a specific economic system, but primarily it put before men the ideal for the pursuit of which their freedom from the cares of life is imperative. Therefore, the structure of society which Mussulmans will raise in pursuit of their Islamic ideal will be different from that which Socialism proposes to build or has built in Russia. It is, however, conceivable that so far as the

effort to make men free from the material cares of life goes, it may under both the systems be similar in many respects." (p. 65).

Economic issues involved in the Pakistan Movement were specifically discussed by Professor Wilfred Cantwell Smith in his booklet *The Muslim League* (1942—45). His thesis could be described thus in his own words: "The situation now is that the anti-communalist cry is being used by the Hindu reactionaries to cover a programme of exploitation. This can be understood only at the level of economic development. . . . By now, the earliest and the most powerful capitalist group, which may be called "Hindu" for lack of a more precise name, has developed to a point where it is ready to dominate the entire country. . . . Recently these Hindu middle classes have not only been seeking to free themselves from foreign imperialist subjection, but have also been seeking more and more to control and exploit the whole of India. They want to sell their goods, to invest their money, to find lucrative positions, and to extend their culture, over as large an area as possible. Their aim is to expand and to exploit with as little opposition as may be. . . . Middle class Muslims are opposed to the domination and exploitation of all India by the Hindu Big Business (now symbolised in the state capitalism of the 1944-45 Bombay Plan) not for economic reasons only. The Muslim *bourgeoisie* is indeed determined to resist economic suppression or subordination at the hands of the Hindu monopoly capitalist group. But they are oppressed also for liberal and religious reasons. . . . They have not responded to an all-India programme which, they have felt, will leave their peoples in a cultural backwater and their home lands as an agricultural hinterland exploited for raw materials and a market by the distant and alien centres of Hindu civilization." (pp. 9, 10, 16, 18).

With regard to the character of the Pakistan Movement, Smith observed: "Muslim separatism is now the ideology of the progressives; and it has come to stay—and to grow, as a creative part of progress. The dynamic elements of the *bourgeoisie*, the young intellectuals, the middle class left-wing striving to build a better world, and even the lower classes insofar as they are

politically conscious, have taken part in it and been inspired by it. . . . The League, then, has become a Muslim nationalist organization first by the adherence to it of the Muslim *bourgeoisie* and more recently by the adherence of the peasantry. . . . the Muslim middle classes have joined the League because they have seen in it an opportunity for increased middle class advantage for themselves. . . . The middle class Muslims realized one after the other that . . . . if Pakistan were achieved, they would have an opportunity of investing their money, of dominating commerce, the professions, and government service, of raising tariff to foster their own industries, and so on. . . . This new ideology of Muslim nationalism, not against the Hindus but as a community along with the Hindus, has liberated a new energy and given promise of engendering a new culture. Of the individuals who have built up and have been leading these peasant movements as progressives within the League, a number of them have been *ex*-communists. They have discovered that a synthesis of religio-nationalist and secular appeals is a potent force, when a purely profane socialist programme failed to win response." (pp. 7-8, 12, 13, 14, 20).

To that Smith adds: "Similarly, to the intellectual and the idealist has come an unprecedented inspiration from the appeal to serve a community which they feel is their own, the appeal to work for the regeneration of Islam so that its people may climb to new heights of grandeur, and its values be re-expressed in new concrete achievements. This appeal has synthesized for them — into one call of duty that is also a glorious promise of salvation — that religion, to whose tradition they are proudly and profoundly sensitive, and their twentieth century environment, whose opportunities they are longing to realize. The Muslim League, then, has been becoming the organ of a surging nationalism; at its centre a hard core of business interests intent on power, but supported also by an awakened peasantry, and surrounded by a nationalism's complete paraphernalia, of poetry and a whole cultural renascence, of youthful idealism and open-hearted devotion." (pp. 20-21).

In fact, the economic factor was present throughout the Muslim struggle for emancipation. As early as the eighteenth century

Shah Waliullah attributed the decline of Muslim political power to the emergence of a rich class of feudal lords, heavy drain on the treasury exercised by people without any productive activity and to the serious unrest among the general mass of people because of heavy taxes. Tipu Sultan, in order to fight effectively against the British had to initiate economic reforms of significance. When Muslim political power was lost, the collaboration on the part of Hindu trading interests with the British at the expense of Muslims added to the estrangement between the two nations.

Sir Syed's analysis of the causes of 1857 Revolt was almost wholly based on economic factors such as the throttling of indigenous industries, rapacity of money-lenders, widespread unemployment and the systematic exclusion of Muslims from higher administrative ranks. His Aligarh Movement with educational uplift of Muslims had also the underlying aim of making Muslims economically better placed. The Muslims lamented annulment of the Partition of Bengal because that deprived them of an opportunity to rehabilitate themselves economically. When the All-India Muslim League fought for the political rights of Muslims, and wanted to ensure effective Muslim representation in the legislature, obviously the motive was the economic betterment of the people.

Islam was not merely a slogan or a cliche, it was meant in a concrete form — the establishment of a society based on egalitarianism. Iqbal was the first great politician who pleaded for Pakistan in order to implement a social democracy in consonance with the spirit of Islamic law. During the late 'thirties, the speeches of most of the League leaders gave strong expression to the view that Muslims wanted to shake off the yoke of British Imperialism as well as of Hindu capitalism. The Quaid-i-Azam condemned capitalism and feudalism in no uncertain terms. Under his presidentship the All-India Muslim League passed resolutions in support of state industrialization and reforms in the land tenure system. The contemporary writers on Pakistan Movement gave due emphasis on the economic factors and pleaded for a society based on egalitarian

principles. The Punjab Muslim League Manifesto of 1944 and the Bengal Muslim League Manifesto of 1945 advocated the establishment of a socialist society, of course in consonance with the teachings of Islam. Thus the economic factors were the predominant element in the Pakistan Movement from 1937 to 1947, when Pakistan came into being.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahmad, Khan A. : The Founder of Pakistan, Through Trial to Triumph: London, 1942

Ambedkar, B. R. : Pakistan or the Partition of India: First Pakistan Edition: Lahore, 1976

A Punjabi: Confederacy of India: Lahore, 1939

Chirol, Valentine: Indian Unrest: London, 1910

Durrani, F. K. Khan: The Meaning of Pakistan: Lahore, 1944

The Future of Islam in India: Lahore, 1929

Fischer, Louis: A Week with Gandhi: Bombay, 1944

Frazer, Lovat: India Under Curzon and After: London, 1911

Hali, Altāf Husain: Hayat-i-Javed: Cawnpore, 1901

Halide Edib: Inside India: London, 1937

Hamid, Dr. Abdul: Muslim Separation in India: Lahore, 1967

Hodson, H. V. : The Great Divide: London, 1969

Iftikharul Haq: Pakistan and Constituent Assembly: Lahore, 1946

India's Problem of Her Constitution: Bombay, 1940

Iqbal, Dr. Mohammad: Allahabad Address: Appendix to Durrani's book "The Meaning of Pakistan"

Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam: Lahore, 1951

Jamiluddin Ahmad: Speeches and Writings of Quaid-i-Azam, Two Volumes: Lahore, 1968

Through Pakistan to Freedom: Lahore, 1944

The Indian Constitutional Tangle: Lahore, 1941

Khalid Bin Sayeed: Pakistan, The Formative Phase: Karachi, 1960

Khaliquzzaman: Pathway to Pakistan: Lahore, 1961

Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah: Lahore, 1943

Mahmud, Dr. Syed: Hindu-Muslim Cultural Accord: Bombay, 1949

Majumdar, R. C.: History of the Freedom Movement in India: Vols. I and II: Calcutta, 1963

Minutes of Evidence given before the Joint Committee on Indian Constitutional Reforms (*Session 1932-33*): Vol. II: London 1934

M.R.T.: Pakistan and Muslim India: Bombay, 1942

Mohammad Ali: My Life, A Fragment: Lahore, 1942

Noman, Muhammad: Muslim India: Allahabad, 1942

Pal, Bipin Chandra: Nationality and Empire: Calcutta, 1916

Memory of My Life and the Times: Calcutta, 1932

Pakistan Historical Society: A History of the Freedom Movement, Vol. II, Part I and Part 2: Vol. III, Part I and Part 2: Karachi, 1960-63

Pasha, Akbar: Pakistan Achieved: Madras, 1947

Pirzada, Sharifuddin: Evolution of Pakistan: Karachi, 1963

Foundations of Pakistan: Vol. I: Karachi, 1969

Foundations of Pakistan, Vol. II, Karachi, 1970

Punjab Muslim Students' Federation: Khilafat-i-Pakistan Scheme: Lahore, 1939

Qasimi, Abdul Quddus: Mazamin-i-Jamaluddin Afghani: Lahore (date not given)

Qureshi, Dr. Ishtiaq Husain: Struggle for Pakistan: Karachi, 1965

Rahman, S.*:* Why Pakistan? : Calcutta, 1946

Rahmat Ali, Ch. : Pakistan: London, 1947

The Millat and the Mission: Cambridge, 1944

India, the Continent of Dinia or the Country of Doom?: Cambridge, 1941

Now or Never: Cambridge, 1933

The Millat and Her Minorities (Haideristan): Cambridge, 1946

The Millat and Her Minorities (Faruqistan): Cambridge, 1946

Rifa'at, Mubarazuddin: Maqam-i-Jamaluddin Afghani: Karachi, 1969

Saiyid, Matloob-ul-Hasan: Jinnah, A Political Study: Lahore, 1945

Sedition Committee Report: Calcutta, 1918

Selected Speeches of Rt. Hon. John Bright on Public Questions: London

Shafi, Mian Ahmad, Haji Abdullah Haroon, A Biography: Karachi (year not given)

Sikandar Hayat Khan: Outlines of a Scheme of Indian Federation: Lahore, 1939

Smith, Wilfred Cantwell: The Muslim League, 1942-45: Lahore, 1945

Sufi, G.M.D.: Common Sense on Pakistan: Bombay, 1946

Suleri, Z.A. : Whither Pakistan? London (date not given)
The Road to Peace and Pakistan: Lahore, 1944

Symonds, Richard: The Making of Pakistan: London, 1950

Zafarul Hasan, Syed, and Dr. Mohammad Afzal Husain Qadri: The Problem of Indian Muslims and its Solution: Aligarh, 1939

Newspapers and Journals

The Comrade : 1911-14
The Inqilab : 1928-31
Urdu-i-Mualla : 1909

...tion of Bengal and aftermath
THE CROSS ROAD ba...
WAR separate electorates
SCHEME Hindu nationalis...
...ederation and confederation PROPO...
MUSLIM LEAGUE O...
...qbal's Letters

National Book Foundation
KARACHI·ISLAMABAD·LAHORE·PESHAWAR·QUETTA·SUKKUR·MULTAN